

THE PROTESTANT

Edited by KENNETH LESLIE

Associate Editors

JAMES L. ADAMS
JOSEPH BRAININ

H. RUTLEDGE SOUTHWORTH
PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

Editorial Advisers

RUTH NANDA ANSHEN
RUSSELL C. BABROUR
G. A. BORGESE
DWIGHT J. BRADLEY
JAMES A. BRAY
HENRIETTA BUCKMASTER
KARL M. CHWOROWSKY
W. ELLIS DAVIES
JEROME DAVIS
MARK A. DAWBER
FREDERICK M. ELIOT
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
J. M. FREEMAN
STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN
F. W. GOOCH
JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN
CHESTER E. HODGSON
WALTER M. HORTON
EDWIN H. HUGHES

HEWLETT JOHNSON
FREDERICK D. KERSHNER
JOHN A. LEE
DAVID LORD
DONALD LOTHROP
J. A. MACCALLUM
JOHN A. MACKAY
JOHN MACMURRAY
CLIFTON MACON
H. D. A. MAJOR
JOHN A. F. MAYNARD
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
CONRAD H. MOEHLMAN
JAMES MOFFATT
JOSEPH G. MOORE
KAREN MORLEY
LOUIE D. NEWTON
ROBERT H. NICHOLS
EDWARD L. PARSONS
WILHELM PAUCK

EDWIN MCN. POTEAT
GORDON POTEAT
A. CLAYTON POWELL
LEONHARD RAGAZ
BEN RICHARDSON
LESLIE ROBERTS
RAYMOND ROBINS
W. S. RYCROFT
D. R. SHARPE
ALVA TAYLOR
WATSON THOMSON
PAUL TILlich
CHANNING H. TOBIAS
GREGORY VLASTOS
O. WALTER WAGNER
RUFUS W. WEAVER
ROBERT WHITAKER
HENRY N. WIEMAN
CLAUDE WILLIAMS

VOL. V

MAY, 1944

No. 8

ROOSEVELT AND THE PEOPLE'S WAR

And other editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

*—There is no living politically available American alternative
to Roosevelt in the world struggle against Fascism.*

Too many of our liberals are time wasters and energy wasters, diverting and frustrating the decent tendencies in America which are so scattered that unless they can be brought to see the necessity for a great common effort illiberalism will win the day.

The Wisconsin primaries and their aftermath should be enough to shock our liberals into a sense of reality, noting for instance the instant reaction of the New York newspaper *PM*, healthy and of sound common sense. *PM* said the lesson of Wisconsin was that we must all work for the re-election of Roosevelt.

I am fully aware of the risk we take in a religious magazine when we offer concrete political counsel on the domestic scene. It is considered religious "cricket" to come out for general theories of social reform. It has been considered quite in order for great ecclesiastical machines to bring political influence to bear on such questions as prohibition, birth control and similar questions. These ecclesiastical bodies undoubtedly believe that such questions belong to that realm of morals which involves religion itself. In other words certain questions are

keystones in the arch of the integrity of man. The questions posed by this present world struggle are such questions. Far more than birth control or prohibition they deal with the fundamental integrity of man. The question is actually: does he really want to be a man after all? Or is he to become a squeaking doll? That is the issue of the world struggle which proceeds under the form of "peace", "war", "incident" or what have you. The people's cause seldom gets a break in these struggles and today it is getting a break in British-American-Russian unity—a unity which is of course very wobbly and full of imperfections and injustices but which is infinitely better than disunity. Fighting the injustices of the present situation we must not lose touch with what justice we have in hand. We must move inside the actual struggle. We must not sabotage the actual struggle in the name of an abstract struggle. The people's cause is better off with Roosevelt and Churchill and Stalin pulling together than pulling apart. It is that simple. The alternative is: the United States versus the rest of the world. For do you consider it a possible alternative that Britain and America might oppose Russia? If so you are dreaming. Britain is *now* in the orbit of Russian power. The British Tories *cannot* arrange to oppose Russia even if the British people would consent, which they won't. Britain is with Europe for better or for worse and her empire is liquidated—Churchill has presided over it in spite of himself. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, all of whom graduated from the empire after the last war, have shown clearly by their suggestions for air-lane control as well as in other ways that they look to the future international world and have turned their backs on the whole concept of empire. So America would be alone and very lonely in any anti-Russian crusade. Moreover a large enough section of American business understands the vital importance to us of Russian trade after the war. Right here in this country the fomenters of war against Russia will not reach first base provided we liberals support Roosevelt and all who back him in his policy of rapprochement with Russia. On the other hand if we oppose him we may definitely lose the whole struggle against Fascism insofar as this country is concerned. Fascism here is a very real threat. Even Roosevelt in the White House may not be able to stop it. Without him . . .

Reinhold Niebuhr has done more than any other Protestant theologian in this country to confront Protestant liberals with the necessity of making a choice as between two concrete living alternatives. He, more than any other, has exposed the futile hypocrisy of preaching an ideal perfection while the world is going to hell in a bucket for lack of something, not the best yet better than the worst, possible of concrete human achievement.

It is because we believe in the religious commitment to the world struggle against Fascism, it is because we believe that Fascist forces in America are using anti-Fascist phraseology in their attack against Roosevelt, it is because, far from perfect though he is, *there is no living politically available American alternative to Roosevelt in this world war against Fascism* that we believe it to be the duty of all who have the slightest regard for the future of America in the world to support Roosevelt. We do not speak here of partisan politics. The emergency is too great for partisan consideration. Mr. Willkie has performed an act of great statesmanship in precipitating and exhibiting the true nature of the present control of the Republican Party. We know that the Democratic Party is no better, but through a feat of political legerdemain Roosevelt has succeeded up to now in so balancing the forces within the Democratic Party as to be able to use that party as an instrument for one of the greatest reform movements this country has known. It is much to be feared that Roosevelt may be unable to prolong his achievement another four years. The city votes which supported his domestic program are being weaned away from him on his foreign program. Certain sections of big business, of the South, and of the Northern industrial vote are being swung away from Roosevelt on the grounds of his new friendship for Stalin. There are even those who might

vote against Roosevelt because of his friendship for the Vatican. If these various forces should win and a man were put into the White House who would, responsive to these forces, alienate the Soviet Union it would mean, we soberly believe, a period of black reaction, perhaps a type of Fascism as evil as Nazism itself in these United States. Mr. Willkie could do more than any other liberal to lead the way in a movement of non-partisan support for Roosevelt. He has been critical, and justly so, of many of the details in Roosevelt's foreign policy. If he had been in Roosevelt's place, even subject to the same pressures, he might have done better. Yet Roosevelt has put Republicans into the most responsible administrative positions and as between Roosevelt and the present temper of the Republican Party Willkie is certainly in the camp of Roosevelt. Willkie has done some fine things during his brief political career. He could do no greater thing than to support Roosevelt in this fateful year when the welfare of the whole world depends upon a continuance of collaboration between the U.S.A., Britain and Russia. In the present emergency those who believe in Willkie (including Willkie himself) will find it difficult indeed to find an alternative course of political action.

LIBERAL "AID" TO RUSSIA

A group of men including Stringfellow Barr, William Agar, H. P. van Dusen, Matthew Woll, and George Shuster calling themselves "Friends of Aid to Russia" have put out a statement criticizing Russia for insisting on what is called "a unilateral settlement of the Polish problem," in other words the decision of Russia to take back that part of Poland which was taken away from her after the Polish-Russian war of 1920-21. These so-called friends of aid to Russia say that "Poland was the first nation to stop Hitler's procession of bloodless victories." And that they did it at a time "when Russia thought it necessary to collaborate with Hitler." The statement goes on to say that Russia participates in our decisions in the West but refuses our participation in her decisions in the East. And from then on this statement castigates Russia for playing into the hands of our isolationist senators and newspapers and says "thus the hopeful trend in America shown in the Gallup poll and in the votes of Congress toward a new world order is threatened."

These friends say "Americans have disavowed all efforts to interfere with the Soviet regime, and they welcomed Russia's disavowal of American Communists." They go on "if we are left uncertain whether or not Russia intends to disregard the feelings and convictions of those millions of the United Nations who are looking forward to the triumph of democratic justice in the relations of all nations, great and small, there exists an urgent danger that Americans will revert to isolationism." "Russia must choose. She can impose her will but she cannot impose it without estranging millions of Americans whose opinions may be decisive in the development of our foreign policy."

Now put this shoe on the other foot. Suppose such an article appeared in *War and the Working Class* signed by a group of similarly distinguished Russians. Suppose it said something like this: "America must choose. Either she can make war on Spain or she can estrange the Russian millions who have watched her ambassador Carlton Hayes fawning on Franco. Either she can end her civil war against the Negro people or there is grave danger of Russia reverting to isolationism. Either Britain can keep Nehru and thousands of other Indian leaders in jail or and so on." How would we receive such an article? Would we like to be reminded of our role in the preparation of the current holocaust?

The rasping arrogance hidden under the smooth phrasing of this statement must be particularly galling to the Russians who have been overrun by the Nazi plague, their land ravaged, their whole country torn and bleeding from end to

end, having suffered unimaginable torment both physical and spiritual. Just as with superhuman effort they push the invader towards the edge of their country they hear the voices of American "liberals" scolding them for their "apparent determination to take back a part of Russia which had been taken away from them when they were too weak to prevent it, chiding them for "recognizing" Badoglio *whom we set up in business in Italy!* Yes, it would be difficult indeed for Stalin to please these "liberals." The reason may not be far to seek. More than one of these distinguished "liberals" is a well-seasoned enemy of the Soviet Union. For instance George Shuster, president of Hunter College, recently famous for the Hitlerite halter he put over the mouths of his teachers. In September, 1933, Shuster wrote in *The Commonweal* regarding the choice, by the Vatican, of Hitler over against the Vatican's own German Center Party, as follows:

"It (the Vatican) chose between 'going into the Catacombs,' with the chance of winning over the disaffected particularly among members of former worker parties, and opening its doors without a word to the huge, angry, embittered crowds who have rallied to Hitler's support.

"Time alone can prove whether the decision was right or wrong. It seems to me obvious, however, that here again reason was on the side of Rome."

The then editor of *The Commonweal*, Michael Williams, as well as its present editor, Edward Skillin, are signers of this statement. Among other signers are such "friends" of aid to Russia as John Chamberlain of the *New York Times*, Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor, Thomas F. Woodlock, who appears as simply "editor" (he edits the *Wall Street Journal*). Other "friends" are Arthur Goldsmith, Joe Kennedy's one-time broker who now operates as a diverter of liberal energies, Major "wrong-way" George Fielding Eliot, the commentator, H. V. Kaltenborn, the "pacifist," Rev. Robert W. Searle, General Secretary of the Greater New York Federation of Churches.

Rev. Harold P. Marley of the Unitarian Church in Dayton, Ohio has sent us for publication an open letter to Mr. Searle which follows:

Dear Colleague:

As one minister to another, I would like to raise some questions apropos the communication which you and several other leaders in metropolitan New York addressed to Joseph Stalin.

Do you not agree, in the first place, that we should begin all such critical judgments of Russian border policy with an admission that during the comparable period in American history we did some rounding-out, and strong-armed our way to a western seaport? Should we not also admit that we were guilty of adding to the post-war confusion in 1918 which led to the Polish infringement of the Russian border now under dispute?

Even granting that now is the time to call the matter of Russian foreign policy into question, while she is still in the process of destroying the German army, would it not be well to offer an apology for all the untruths which have been solemnly told against her by religious conservatives, journalists and others? Not to go back too far, what about the Russo-Finnish war when America was blindly pro-Finland in word and deed, just as she is now anti-Ireland? Both these little countries, like Judea of old, are suffering for their geographical position, but Finland added the additional threat of a Manerheim line.

Your group uses as many words to slap the wrist of Russia, as Germany used divisions to try to crush the whole Soviet strength. You will fail as badly, because the Russian people have a mind of their own, even if as you assume, they have no conscience. They already know the "line" of the American pseudo-liberal and quasi-socialist—those who howl for "civil liberty" in order to pay lip service to the poor and downtrodden, while they go right

ahead serving the established order. Our moderate Leftists become panic-stricken at any true revolt of the people, begin calling names, and bring joy to the camp of the reactionaries. These guardians of the old order undoubtedly had a quiet laugh over your statement, like they guffawed at the "quart of milk" speech of the Vice President. And they go right on milking the Hottentot.

You see, if you are going to take issue with the foreign policy of an ally, had you not better look to our own? In a period of history which is more laden with international issues than ever before, our State Department has shown itself to be only mediocre—sometimes, medieval. It has even failed to fairly represent to the world outside the enlightened capitalistic, Protestant, democracy which we at best are. Foreign policy should be an extension of domestic life. This is a challenge to do something about our own imperfections rather than take a holier-than-thou attitude toward a near neighbor. It is not necessary to catalog all the vicious seeds which are being sown in season and out which will surely produce a variety of homegrown stuff scarcely edible at any table. You and the others know what is wrong if you listen to our demagogues, in Congress and out.

In view of all these things, I am shocked that you should take precious time to censure a heroic blood-stained nation which is fighting on, thank God, behind the ropes. When we have put both feet in the ring and are fighting with both fists, we can talk. By then, we may not have so much time for rhetoric. Only when the big guns are silenced is the pen mightier than the sword. Had the South won at Gettysburg, there would have been no Gettysburg speech.

THE BANKRUPT AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

The following letter brings to the surface the significance of one of the most dastardly attacks THE PROTESTANT has yet received. These attacks, coming through the American Jewish Committee and its National Conference of Christians and Jews have their real source in the Christian Front, which is the American form of clerical-Fascism, a front for anti-democratic Fascist forces in all three faiths. The Woltman articles (Woltman himself is simply a journalist badly in need of work) repeat the same misstatements which have been spread large in the parochial press, the most unfair of which is that we are "anti-Catholic." Woltman's attempt to belittle our work has been sent out to thousands of our readers and supporters by the American Jewish Committee.

On our recent visits to Philadelphia and Chicago where we organized Christian ministers into Regional Action Groups to fight anti-Semitism, we found that our ministers had received free copies of the Woltman articles from the American Jewish Committee. The members of our Advisory Board of course received them with a covering letter promising more "spicy" things to follow. A whispering campaign is under way in which Mr. Woltman is actively engaging. Such tactics indicate the bankruptcy of the case of the American Jewish Committee against THE PROTESTANT. Rabbi Simsovitz has correctly put his finger upon the cruel role the American Jewish Committee is playing in preventing the shocking truth about the rise of anti-Semitism from being made public. This is being done (whether every American Jewish Committee member knows it or not) so that the public may be caught off guard when "the Jews" will be substituted for the Axis as our enemy.

It is just that bad. For whatever reason, whether the American Jewish Committee simply distrusts democracy and its process of open publicity, or knowingly wills Fascism (don't be shocked, human beings *do* turn into Fascists!), the American Jewish Committee prefers to bargain with Fascists (whether, I repeat,

as friends or enemies) behind closed doors. The American Jewish Committee no more represents the Jewish people than the clerical-Fascists represent the Roman Catholic or Protestant people.

It is time the good people of all three faiths became wise to themselves and to the fine-spun net their big shot leaders are weaving for them. It is to open the eyes of the good people to this net that we publish the Brainin series of exposures. This series, we believe, constitutes a prophylactic against the insidious disease which threatens the life of our democracy.

March 6, 1944

Mr. John Slawson
American Jewish Committee
386 Fourth Avenue
New York 16, New York
Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of a circular letter in which you refer to the findings of Frederick Woltman of the *World Telegram* regarding THE PROTESTANT magazine. I also received the inclosed reprint of Mr. Woltman's article and it is with reluctance that I should like to make a few observations.

The entire affair takes on an ominous character in view of the behavior of the American Jewish Committee in the past few years. The most charitable view that can be taken in this matter is that the American Jewish Committee has embarked upon a "smear campaign" calculated to implant in the minds of Jews doubts concerning the truths printed by THE PROTESTANT magazine. That the Committee finds such proceedings necessary at this time is more of a reflection upon its way of thinking than upon the character of the editor of the said magazine.

Let us be candid about this. The American Jewish Committee has during the past few years bitterly fought every liberal force within the Jewish fold, and it has chosen to play the role of militant reaction in the Jewish street. It fights the forces of democracy within the Jewish community life and it flaunts every normal and healthy sentiment expressed by the great majority of Jews in America. Its position on Zionism and the American Jewish Conference is unforgivable from the democratic point of view. Its position on anti-Semitism is unwise to say the least. I say anti-Semitism knowing full well that the Committee denies the existence of any such force. The Committee persists in this, the twelfth year after Hitler, speaking about race prejudice and it studiously avoids the word anti-Semitism in its utterances. The implication is obvious. The Committee does not admit that there is an international war against the Jewish people or that Jews are really the victims of anti-Democratic forces. Such admissions would inevitably lead to different tactics of combat and to a point of view that is not in harmony with the economic interests of those who make the American Jewish Committee. Anti-Semitism, dear sir, is a method to combat democracy by driving a wedge into the forces that make for progress and by casting a fog of obscurantism upon the bitter political and economic issues of the day. It is "scapegoatism" and the only thing that it has in common with race-prejudice is that the victim is the same. In short, anti-Semitism, that Jew hatred which has the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" as its Bible and of which Julius Streicher is the godfather, can be fought only by more political and economic democracy everywhere and by branding it for what it is, namely, the sword by which Fascism seeks to make inroads into democracy. Any other interpretation is not only shortsightedness but is also responsible for dividing the harassed Jewish forces that seek to combat anti-Semitism.

THE PROTESTANT magazine has been very vociferous in pointing out this view and its militant policy runs counter to the Committee's and

thus you have decided to fight THE PROTESTANT. Where such tactics lead to should be amply clear even to the Committee. It must be clear even to the Committee that a smear campaign employing the tactics of "Red Baiting" and anti-Catholicism is the chosen weapon of the Peglers, Hearsts and Coughlins and all would-be forces of Fascism in this country. It is a method from which Jews ought to steer clear. This does not even touch upon the question of veracity. Surely even you can distinguish between anti-Vaticanism and anti-Catholicism. Even you can distinguish between the view that sees Russia as a very potent international factor making for peace and a better world order and advocating Communism.

One cannot escape the inference that there is some kind of a tie-up between the recent "achievement" of the Committee in soliciting the testimonial letter from Archbishop Spellman and this campaign to smear THE PROTESTANT. That the Spellman letter was of questionable value in the fight against anti-Semitism is rather clear. His Excellency speaks of race prejudice, bigotry and similar platitudes disregarding the more dangerous aspects of Coughlinism and Christian Frontism. It is only members of the American Jewish Committee who will be satisfied with such a testimonial. The question that your fight against THE PROTESTANT will inevitably raise in the minds of many Jews is whether there is no tie-up between the efforts that went in to elicit that letter and the combat against what you choose to call anti-Catholicism in which you are now engaging.

The record of the Committee is beginning to be crystal clear. Hitherto, it fought democracy within the Jewish fold and now it is extending its fight elsewhere. The Committee represents a numerically insignificant minority of Jews, but it sure makes a lot of noise. Instead of seeking to heal the "Hurt of the Daughter of my People" it is adding fuel to the fire and causing dissension and tragedy amidst a stricken and a demoralized people. This role remains on the record to its everlasting shame.

Sincerely yours,

RABBI LOUIS SIMSOVITZ.

LS/tr

Port Chester, N. Y.

"BOSTON PLAN" WORKS

"Malden Band with Jewish Boy Attacked." This was a front page headline in the *Boston Traveller* on March 18th. "Hoodlums attacked members of a Malden band during the Evacuation Day parade yesterday in South Boston, injuring about 15 persons and smashing instruments, incensed because a Jewish boy was in the group, Malden officials charged today." Thus the story began.

Policemen were on the spot but no arrests were made. The Police Commissioner himself arrived at the scene of the riot in time to witness the end of the attack. Yet, when confronted with reliable evidence of the anti-Semitic motivation of the outrage he persisted in the belief that it was hoodlumism minus anti-Semitism.

Forewarned by the nature of previous outrages in Boston, The Textbook Commission of THE PROTESTANT anticipated just such an emergency and prepared to meet it. On February 16 at a luncheon meeting called by The Textbook Commission a large group of Boston clergymen elected to office a steering committee of representatives to take rapid and effectual action should any such incident occur.

Hence, within twenty-four hours after receipt of the report of the South Boston outrage, ten distinguished Protestant ministers, members of the steering committee, met to take action. They held their committee meeting, satisfied

themselves as to the anti-Semitic nature of the attack, and then visited the Police Commissioner. They were closeted with him for over an hour, asking why arrests were not made, insisting that arrests must be made, and urging upon him their full cooperation to prevent such lawless activity. They were cordial, gracious and firm. The police were cooperative and gave every reason to hope that in the future such shameful incidents would be prevented by a more adequate vigilance.

The following day Boston newspapers carried front-page headlines of a happier nature than that which began these paragraphs. "Ten Protestant Clerics Ask Sullivan to Curb Anti-Jewish Violence." That was on the front page of the *Boston Globe*. The *Boston Herald* also gave the enemy cause to know he was being watched: "POLICE REPORT ASKED ON ROW." The story followed: "A delegation of 10 clergymen, representing the Greater Boston ministers who recently organized to combat anti-Semitism, yesterday called on Police Commissioner Sullivan and Supt. Edward W. Fallon at Boston police headquarters . . . In the delegation were: the Revs. Dana McLean Greeley, Arlington St. Church, Earl Douglas, Boston City Mission; Charles Foffie, Rush A. M. Zion Church, Cambridge; Leonard Helie, First Church in Roxbury, Donald G. Lothrop, Community Church; Douglas Frazier, Director of youth activities, Universalist Church of America; Mark P. Strickland, First Congregational Church, Stoneham; Leroy Congdon, Universalist Church, Wakefield; and W. Ellis Davies of New York, chairman, Ministerial Associates of THE PROTESTANT."

Our heartiest congratulations go to these ministers, who, under the diligent leadership of their local chairman, Donald G. Lothrop, have not only made an enormously valuable contribution to the fight against anti-Semitism in Boston, but have established a pattern which is being duplicated in city after city as The Textbook Commission continues its organization of Regional Committees for such action throughout the United States.

TEXTBOOK COMMISSION ON THE JOB

On March 31st, under a Washington dateline, the Associated Press released a dispatch reporting a speech by Representative James M. Curley of Massachusetts. The story emphasized that the Congressman's address, dealing with the heroism of Jews in war time, cost the taxpayers \$900—the cost of printing in the *Congressional Record* the names of 2,500 Jewish soldiers who had been awarded the Purple Heart. The New York *Times* published the AP story under the subtitle "Curley House Speech and List of Names Cost \$900 in *Record*."

On April 5th we sent the following telegram to Kent Cooper, General Manager of the Associated Press:

With respect to your story dated Washington, March 31, reporting representative Curley's speech in Congress in which he praised the record of the Jews in this war we are astounded at the manner in which the Associated Press has treated this story emphasizing the monetary cost to the Nation involved in printing the story in the *Congressional Record*. In view of the present alarming growth of anti-Semitism in this country we respectfully request that you explain how this story came to be slanted in such a fashion particularly in view of the fact that this is completely at variance with the usual treatment of news by the Associated Press. We eagerly await a statement from you on this matter.

On April 6th a representative of the Textbook Commission communicated with Alan J. Gould, Assistant General Manager of the AP, and discussed with him our request for an explanation. The next day we received from Mr. Gould the following letter:

"This acknowledges with thanks your telegram to Mr. Cooper respecting an Associated Press dispatch from Washington giving a report of remarks made in Congress by Representative Curley. We were deeply distressed by the manner in

which this story was handled and have taken appropriate measures to make sure nothing of the kind happens again."

It is noteworthy to mention that the Associated Press did not give any explanation of this unfortunate matter to *PM*, the only newspaper to call attention to the March 31st dispatch. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, and Edwin James, its managing editor, likewise refused to make any comment.

On April 8th the *New York Times* published the AP New England Regional Service release (dated March 30) on Mr. Curley's praise of Jewish war heroism, which omitted any mention of the printing cost.

Quick action by the Textbook Commission of THE PROTESTANT and full cooperation on the part of the Associated Press righted at least in part a tragic wrong done the Jewish heroes of the war.

SAND WRITING AND THE INCARNATION

Reverend Otis Moore of Kenilworth, N. J., has torn out a page of our April editorial and sent it back with the following underlined: "The teaching (anti-Semitic teaching in 'Christian' texts) is, to put it colloquially, that God has it in for the Jews because they didn't accept a certain theological teaching." Reverend Moore comments as follows: "That is rather a mild definition of the Incarnation."

Reverend Moore's comment is deeply significant. It springs from what may be called theologism. It is especially significant in this case because it obscures the true meaning of the Incarnation. The whole point of the Incarnation is that it eludes capture in language, however logical or inspired. One way of indicating the meaning of the Incarnation is to call attention to the fact that Jesus, as far as we know, did not write His life into a book. He made no philosophy, He made no theology, He made no church rules. The only record of His writing was when He once leaned over and wrote something in the sand. Sand writing is not a very good anchor for the theologists. I know men who are atheists in their minds but whose hearts are full of God. I know men of Jewish faith, who do not accept the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, yet who definitely incarnate the same spirit which Jesus incarnated. I do not say that they incarnate that spirit as fully as Jesus did, but incarnate that spirit more fully than many baptized Christians who understand and accept with their minds what is known as orthodox theological teaching with regard to the Incarnation.

No, there is no external rite of baptism, however applied, there is no intellectual perception, however subtle, which can guarantee that a man is "saved" or "sane" or "integrated". Theological exercise is inevitable to the human mind which sorts out for identification and later recognition and recalling, human experiences, but the touchstone of salvation is not theological understanding.

THE GREAT FORD LIE

By JOSEPH BRAININ

HENRY FORD is the great protector and patron of anti-Semitism in this country.

This statement is based on records. It is not a conjecture. It is an incontrovertible fact.

Only a few months ago Albert E. Kahn, co-author of "Sabotage," drew up a bill of particulars of Mr. Ford's association with the anti-Semitic activities of powerful individuals and well-organized groups. Mr. Kahn charged, among other items, that:

1. Harry Bennett, notorious liaison man with America's fifth column, is still the chief executive at Dearborn.
2. E. E. Maxie, President, and David Cole, Secretary - Treasurer of the United Sons of America, a secret society established by leaders of the Ku-Klux Klan, are both employees of Henry Ford.
3. Walter E. Long, head of the United Sons of America in Michigan, is employed by the Ford Motor Company. George Mathes, treasurer of the same Klan organization, works at Ford's Lincoln Plant.
4. William Nowell, a renegade Negro, key aide of Gerald L. K. Smith, the head of the America First party, is employed by the Ford Personnel Department operated by Harry Bennett.
5. Heinz Spanknoebel, an agent of the German Military Intelligence, was on the Ford payroll while he was traveling around the United States in the early 1930's organizing the Friends of New Germany, Nazi espionage-sabotage apparatus. While the Nazi agent Fritz Kuhn was organizing the German-American Bund, he too was receiving a weekly pay check from the Ford Motor Company.
6. Father Coughlin's *Social Justice* was, until banned, subsidized by the Ford Motor Company, which purchased approximately 30,000 copies of that Fascist-anti-Semitic publication each week.
7. Some other prominent Ford execu-

tives have been: George Sorenson, one of Henry Ford's most important aides, who was described by William E. Dodd, former Ambassador to Germany, as a "leading Hitlerite in the United States"; Lord Perry, head of the Ford Company of England, who is an intimate of members of England's pro-Nazi "Link"; Gaston Bergery, Ford's personal and business representative in Paris, who is one of the key Nazi agents in France; William J. Cameron, known as the editor of the now defunct *Dearborn Independence*, a notorious anti-Semitic publication is the publicist, director and former radio spokesman for the Ford Motor Company and is the guiding light of the Fascist anti-Semitic Anglo-Saxon Federation; and Charles E. Lindbergh, recently placed in charge of production at the Ford Dearborn Plant.

8. On February 12, 1941, the entire crew of the yacht *San Toy* were arrested and placed on trial in Talcahuano, Chile, on charges of having hauled supplies to Nazi ships at sea. The yacht was owned by the Ford Motor Company agent in Santiago.
9. Parker Sage, the head of the Fascist National Workers League in Detroit which was partly financed with funds received from the Nazi spy Dr. Fred Thomas, held his League rallies at Dearborn property. Sage, who periodically addressed Bund meetings, speaks of Ford as "the greatest living American" who "knows that the Jews got us into this war."
10. Henry Ford's "The International Jew" and his edition of the notorious "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" are still being distributed, by tens of thousands, in Latin-American countries.

Mr. Ford never answered these charges. Nor has the expensive battery of legal talent in his employ sued Mr. Kahn or the publishers for libel. They know better. The pamphlet "Henry Ford Must Choose," published in 1941, by the Friends

Democracy, headed by the Rev. L. M. Birkhead, rendered a great service to the cause of democracy. It exposed Mr. Ford's biology to Louis Marshall in 1927*) as a cruel hoax. It was a challenge to the Jewish defense organizations to look behind Gerald L. K. Smith, Winrod and Coughlin and to recognize Henry Ford as the great purveying-belt of anti-Semitic propaganda. Mr. L. M. Birkhead's pamphlet traced Mr. Ford's active cooperation with Fascism since the early '20's, when America's motor king had helped finance Hitler. The pamphlet proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that the anti-Semitic gleaders around Mr. Ford were still his most intimate advisers. W. J. Cameron, Mr. Ford's publicity director to this day, was exposed in the Birkhead booklet as the mastermind of the anti-Semitic organization known as the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America.

A complete and irrefutable case against Mr. Ford had been made public by a group that refused to be intimidated—yet the organization entrusted with the defense of Jewish rights remained silent. Here was an excellent opportunity for the American Jewish Committee, which in 1927 had been the recipient of Ford's promise to discontinue his anti-Semitic activities, to speak up and demand an accounting. But the Committee kept quiet. It had, as a matter of record, most carefully avoided mention of Mr. Ford's affiliation with anti-Semitic propaganda during his years of most active espousal of the Hitlerite cause. In the summer of 1939 *The Contemporary Jewish Record*, published by the American Jewish Committee, ran a series of articles by a member of the Committee's Research Staff under the heading "Problems of Anti-Semitism in the United States." These articles named nearly all the anti-Semitic small fry, but there was no mention whatever of the work of the Anglo-Saxon Federation or of Cameron. Ford's name occurred only once, and then in a manner to create the impression that Henry Ford had kept his promise to Louis Marshall.

In the July, 1940, issue of the same publication of the American Jewish Committee, again there appeared an article by Nathaniel H. Goodrich, another member

of the Committee's Research Staff. Here, too, no mention whatsoever was made of Ford or Cameron or the Anglo-Saxon Federation. It is also significant that in the book "Anti-Semitism in America," by Dr. Donald S. Strong, based on data supplied by the Committee's staff, nothing is said of Henry Ford's post-1927 activities or of Cameron or the Anglo-Saxon Federation.

These omissions cannot be explained by ignorance, as Henry Ford's position as the great inspirer of anti-Semitism was frequently acknowledged in the Nazi-Fascist press, which boasted of his cooperation. No, it was not merely a case of a conspiracy of silence to forget Mr. Ford. Apparently the gentlemen of the American Jewish Committee believed that it was their duty to protect and defend Mr. Ford.

Friday, a weekly published in New York, featured, in the fall of 1940, a series of articles, "Merchants of Hate," exposing anti-Semitic activities in this country, particularly those of Ford and his agents Coughlin and Cameron. When Mr. Edward Morand reprinted several of these articles in the columns of *The Jewish Review* he was denounced by the gentlemen of the Committee just as mercilessly as *Friday* had been attacked by them. *Friday*, as you may remember, was branded a Communist publication. Mr. Morand, however, was first offered a bribe intended to stop the reprinting of the *Friday* exposé of Mr. Ford. The offer came to him through the Inter-Racial Press, an agency that specializes in routine publicity and paid advertisements in the English-Jewish and Yiddish papers. The Inter-Racial Press is in very good standing with the American Jewish Committee. . . . It frequently cooperates with the Committee in various publicity matters relating to Jewish affairs. It unquestionably collaborated with the Committee in the Ford whitewash campaign.

The Inter-Racial Press sent out letters to Jewish editors asking them "to give Ford a break" and stating that "Ford is definitely not anti-Semitic." The concluding sentence of the letter read: "Needless to say, your cooperation will be fully appreciated and reciprocated by this office and will be brought to the attention of the Ford Motor Co."

*) See "American Jewish Committee," II, published in THE PROTESTANT, March, 1944.

While the *Friday* articles were appearing in his paper Mr. Morand received a long telephone call from the Inter-Racial Press. The gentleman at the other end of the wire argued that "Ford wasn't the ogre he had been painted" and promised that if Mr. Morand would stop running the *Friday* exposés he would see to it that the *Jewish Review* would obtain lucrative advertising.

But Mr. Morand continued to reprint *Friday's* exposé of Henry Ford's anti-Semitic plant. And this is how he tells of his experiences:

"I was amazed to find that I was alone. The Yiddish press not only did not reprint the articles but would not carry any of them. *Friday* paid advertising announcing the series.

"I received still another call, this time

Ford Motor Company

ROUGE PLANT

DEARBORN, MICHIGAN

January 7 1942

Mr Sigmund Livingston
160 North La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sir:

In our present national and international emergency, I consider it of importance that I clarify some general misconceptions concerning my attitude toward my fellow-citizens of Jewish faith. I do not subscribe to or support, directly or indirectly, any agitation which would promote antagonism against my Jewish fellow-citizens. I consider that the hate-mongering prevalent for some time in this country against the Jew, is of distinct disservice to our country, and to the peace and welfare of humanity.

At the time of the retraction by me of certain publications concerning the Jewish people, in pursuance of which I ceased the publication of "The Dearborn Independent," I destroyed copies of literature prepared by certain persons connected with its publication. Since that time I have given no permission or sanction to anyone to use my name as sponsoring any such publication, or being the accredited author thereof.

I am convinced that there is no greater dereliction among the Jews than there is among any other class of citizens. I am convinced, further, that agitation for the creation of hate against the Jew or any other racial or religious group, has been utilized to divide our American community and to weaken our national unity.

I strongly urge all my fellow-citizens to give no aid to any movement whose purpose it is to arouse hatred against any group. It is my sincere hope that now in this country and throughout the world, when this war is finished and peace once more established, hatred of the Jew, commonly known as anti-Semitism, and hatred against any other racial or religious group, shall cease for all time.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Ford

Mr. Joshua Epstein, then an executive of the *Jewish Daily Forward* (the Jewish paper maintaining the closest relations with the American Jewish Committee—J.B.). The gist of his conversation is: It is bad business to discriminate against the so-called anti-Semitic concerns. He said: "By refusing Ford's ads the *Forward* would be setting itself up as a censor. I note that the *Forward* had refused the *day* ads—J.B.). That would create a problem—for Ford would lose business, discharge men and tell them that it was the fault of the Jews."

"My hair stood on end. Here was the dirty Jew, 'paying for protection' once again."

"But this was not the end. The *Inter-Racial Press* asked to see me. A Mr. Schwartzman talked to me, in the absence of Mr. Seidman, the owner.

"The conversation was patterned along similar lines: 'Why fight Ford? It is better to have Ford as a friend than as an enemy. Ford is a billionaire. He is too powerful to fight.'"

"I asked: 'Isn't that Appeasement with Capital A?'"

"'No,' said Schwartzman, 'Ford is content with a statement proving his good intentions.'"

But more than a year passed before Mr. Ford's statement was issued. His public relations advisers had a rather difficult time devising a formula that would put over a brand-new whitewash for Mr. Ford. Mr. Marshall was dead, and so was Mr. Ford's letter of apology to him. Yet Mr. Ford's publicity wizards thought it inadvisable to address a new statement to the American Jewish Committee. It wouldn't be smart, they apparently decided, because it would remind some people that Mr. Ford's 1927 letter of "clarification" to the committee had been just a scrap of paper. The braintrusters of Dearborn concocted a new idea. It was rather simple. Mr. Ford would address his scrap of paper, 42 version, to another Jewish organization, one which claims to have the confidence of the Jews of America. Of course, no responsible leaders of American Jewry were promptly ruled out as addressees of the revival of the great Ford lie. They were Stephen S. Wise, President of the American Jewish Congress, and Henry Monksky, President of the B'nai B'rith.

Ford's mouthpiece, Mr. Bennett, did not relish the idea of calling upon either of these two gentlemen. Wise and Monksky might not be easily fooled, Mr. Bennett figured. They might, perhaps, confront Mr. Ford with his record and demand guarantees, or even insist that Mr. Bennett himself and good old Cameron should be dismissed. No, that would not do at all.

So, presumably on the advice of the gentlemen of the American Jewish Committee, staunch standbys of and believers in Henry Ford, an invitation was dispatched to Richard E. Gutstadt, director of the Anti-Defamation League. Mr. Gutstadt flew to Detroit and met Harry Bennett, head of the Ford Personnel Department. The publicity release of the Anti-Defamation League describes Mr. Gutstadt's meeting with Mr. Bennett (Ford's liaison man with America's Fifth column) as follows:

"Mr. Bennett told him (Mr. Gutstadt) that the automobile pioneer was 'highly indignant' over the charges of anti-Semitism leveled against him. During the interview Mr. Ford himself came in and discussed the matter with Mr. Gutstadt, and it was shortly afterwards that Mr. Livingston, Founder and Chairman of the A.D.L., received the now famous letter."

The "famous letter" is reproduced on page 12. This is the document the *Inter-Racial Press* had promised Mr. Morand at the end of 1940.

What a parody and farce!

In the midst of his anti-Semitic labors, at the very time when he was backing and supporting Lindbergh, Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith, Cameron and other leaders of the anti-Jewish campaign, at a time when the hate merchants of Berlin, Madrid and South America were parading his name as that of the great inspirer of their anti-Semitic programs—at that time Henry Ford, "indignant" at the charge of anti-Semitism leveled against him, received a full and complete whitewash from an organization established to fight the defamation of Jews in this country.

What a complete triumph for the policy of the American Jewish Committee! Not merely hush-hush, but organized acclaim by the victims of Mr. Ford's anti-Semitic propaganda, organized applause for the American sponsor of Adolf Hitler, for the

man on whom Hitler had bestowed a medal for services rendered to the Nazi-Fascist cause.

The culprit in this tragic betrayal of Jewry is not so much the Anti-Defamation League, which has on its record some valuable contributions to the defense of Jewish rights in this country. Its leaders were tricked by a long-range conspiracy in which the American Jewish Committee played one of the main roles, a sad role at that, to be sure.

The Ford episode is one of the most sinister chapters in the evolution of Fascist growth in this country, a growth to which the appeasement policy of the American Jewish Committee has contributed in the same measure as the appeasement practiced by an almost identical group in German Jewry contributed to the victory of Hitlerism in Germany.

In my previous articles I submitted indisputable evidence that the American Jewish Committee "consciously allowed the gravest charges against the Jews to go relatively unchallenged, and put up no defense" against anti-Semitism. The Committee stands convicted of this charge by its own testimony.*) I charged the President of the American Jewish Committee, former Judge Joseph Proskauer, with having been one of the founders of the American Liberty League, members of which contributed money for the anti-Semitic activities of the Sentinels of the Republic. I accused the American Jewish Committee of being more concerned with fighting Communism than with combating anti-Semitism, and called it a Jewish Dies Committee, an informer organization. I presented facts which proved that the American Jewish Committee had intentionally sabotaged the American Jewish Conference and thus deliberately destroyed Jewish unity at a time of acute Jewish crisis.

The American Jewish Committee today cooperates with *The Tablet*, the official publication of the Brooklyn Roman Catholic Diocese, which on February 14th characterized the American Jewish Congress headed by Dr. Stephen S. Wise as a Ku-Klux Klan organization and a gestapo unit. The American Jewish Committee approves of

and rejoices in Westbrook Pegler's diatribes against the Jews and labor. The American Jewish Committee uses Fredrick Woltman, America's most notorious smear artist, to besmirch organizations fighting its hush-hush policy.

I have devoted this article to the Ford case because I am firmly convinced that the pernicious influence exerted by the American Jewish Committee in its protection of Henry Ford demoralized a section of the Yiddish and Anglo-Jewish press in America, intimidated an important section of Jewish leadership and stripped Jewish groups and organizations of their defenses, rendering them helpless against the anti-Semitic offensive launched from Dearborn, America's citadel of Fascism.

Anti-Semitism is reaching alarming proportions in this country. It is permeating every layer of our social, economic and political life. It is girding its loins for a supreme assault on our democracy.

Yet the American Jewish Committee's appeasement policy still prevails. Jewish defense organizations do not challenge this policy—which spells disaster, leads irrevocably to self-eradication of the Jewish people and paves the way for second-class citizenship for the Jews in America.

It is difficult—and, indeed, distasteful—for this author, himself a Jew, to acknowledge the participation of a Jewish group in the political game of Fascism. Yet it would be a betrayal of Jewish interest and contrary to the tradition of democracy to cover up the sins of a self-appointed leadership that arrogantly forces its destructive practices on the harassed and persecuted Jewish masses.

I have felt it my duty to expose the American Jewish Committee and to brand it publicly as a group that—whether through cowardice, ignorance or willful design, it matters little which—is renegeing a role which hastened the present plight of the Jews in European lands and which threatens the security of American Jewry.

This is a cruel indictment. But it has to be preferred now, before it is too late.

[This is the third in the series of articles by Mr. Brainin on the record of the American Jewish Committee and its negative influence on the fight against anti-Semitism in this country. Further articles on this subject will appear in due course.—ED.]

* See "American Jewish Committee Betrays Democracy," THE PROTESTANT, January, 1944.

THE HONOR OF PROTESTANT ENGLAND

by PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

WE MAY as well own up to the whole sad and bitter truth; the Zionist movement has suffered a stinging and ignominious defeat in the country which contains the largest, still the freest and potentially by far the most influential Jewish community in the whole world. The anti-Zionist policy embodied in the British White Paper of 1939 which shuts off Jewish immigration into the Holy Land and which radically curtails the sale of land to Jews in Palestine, has now entered into full force. In the four long years that have elapsed since the British Government's reactionary designs with respect to Palestine's future were first announced, the Zionist leadership in America has been unable to muster and set into motion sufficient moral and political energy to frustrate or even to delay the translation into action of that cynically cruel document.

I call it cynically cruel because in that British governmental ukase, which is so subtly colored with the pale and eerie hue of a funeral shroud, may be read Tory England's answer to the Jewish people's hope and anguish. It is nothing less than a death sentence pronounced upon the remnants of European Jewry whose only ray of hope hitherto came from the direction of their Palestinian homeland. That hope has been extinguished. The White Paper's applications further condemn Jewish Palestine itself to economic-industrial sterility and stagnation, which, in the actual circumstances of the country's enforced limited agricultural capacities, means death also.

The time has passed to treat the subject of the Jewish National Home in Palestine and its related problems in an academic, supercilious or leisurely manner as if there were all the time in the world to re-examine the matter *ab initio* and turn it over for inspection from every angle anew. The fundamental directives were set twenty years ago and they have never been altered or countermanded: Britain was charged, at her own request, by the international community of nations with the specific task of facilitating the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine; America and fifty other sovereign states voluntarily subscribed to

that program of action by ratifying the British Mandate over Palestine.

If there remains anything to debate today it is not what objections may now be formulated by Kamsa and Bar-Kamsa* in America, or what certain foreign Arab potentates may now bring forward against the great humanitarian and democratic undertaking in Palestine, but what Britain herself has done with the mandate, in what way she has acquitted herself of her sacred charge and how she fulfills or does not fulfill the trust placed in her by Christian civilization.

The Jewish people's share in the fulfillment of the common task, transforming the wilderness into a habitable place of beauty and promise, erecting the framework of the national structure for the reception and economic absorption of millions of nationally and personally homeless Jews, is an accomplished fact. It has been brought about without the least interference with the civic and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities in the Holy Land, while from the Palestinian Arabs the Jews have taken nothing but their poverty and their diseases. The Jewish effort in Palestine, as a matter of fact, has spilled over to the immense benefit of Britain herself, which gained from the newly-built Jewish Palestine tens of thousands of soldiers to fight her battle in the Libyan desert, in Eritrea, Syria, Somaliland, Ethiopia and Italy, and industrial products to equip her armies with the means to gain a glorious victory. . . .

To look at Britain's record in the Holy Land, on the other hand, and at the manner in which the Jewish people have been and are being treated by the British Colonial Administration fills us with so deep a sense of regret and indignation that we can no longer join in those expressions of abiding faith in Great Britain's ultimate and honorable intentions which are still being issued by official Zionism in a pathetic and desperate attempt to cover up its British partner's

* It is said that because of two Jews, Kamsa and Bar-Kamsa, who disrupted national unity in 70 A.D., that Jerusalem was lost to Titus.

shame and its own political incompetence. Nor does the respect we owe as Christians to the dignity and the peculiar significance of the People of the Book allow us to treat any longer with serious and hopeful consideration those vague, ambiguous and half-hearted assurances of good will to the Jewish people which emanate from time to time from official quarters in London and Washington. For not only are assurances of that kind almost invariably set aside or nullified by subsequent qualifying restrictions, by outright repudiation or by flagrantly contradictory supplementary statements which frequently originate in the same quarters, but they are turned to absolute meaninglessness and to sinister mockery by events.

In the light of the reality, in the light of the concrete deeds of commission and omission of the British Government, these verbal assurances of good will and hope are shocking examples of imperialist cynicism and deception. For by its acts the Tory Government of Great Britain is destroying Jewish Palestine *now* and it is *now* barring the road of escape to European refugees.

This is a terrible charge to make and one that would deservedly bring down upon the head of the accuser the contempt and wrath of all men of good will. It would indeed merit his being silenced with severity by the authorities, if the allegation could not be fully substantiated. Yet it is made here and now, in deep consciousness of its gravity, and not, let it be said, without pain or regret that it must be made.

* * *

It is made because we hear the blood of our Jewish brothers cry from the earth.

It is made because governments who always pride themselves on and boast of their Christian way of life do not practise charity, mercy and compassion.

It is made because of the oath sworn at the Lord's Table to defend His Word and the cause of justice, no matter who the victims of injustice may be, with all our love and with our life itself if needs be.

We therefore say to Great Britain what Nathan said to King David whom he loved and revered: Thou art the man!

Not Hitler, but British imperialism is

keeping the doors of Palestine closed to the weary wanderers of Israel.

Not the truth but all manner of lies invoked to bar Jews from entering a country that God Himself promised them in eternity.

Not the Gestapo, but English policemen in swift PT boats are shooting down Jewish men, women and children who succeeded by almost superhuman efforts to escape from Europe and come within sight of the shores of Palestine.

It is a lie that transportation facilities were lacking for the tens of thousands who stood waiting to be taken out from Poland, Rumania and Hungary a few weeks ago and their little children by the hand until the Nazis moved in and sent them back to die or to death by the extermination squads.

There are boats available now. Boats which transport oil to Franco and boats do transport Jewish refugees to British concentration camps on the leper island of Malta. The thousands waiting on the borders of Turkey, Egypt and Iran can be taken in trucks to Palestine in a few hours' time. No enemy bars the way. The Luftwaffe has been driven away a thousand miles from those areas. What keeps them out of Palestine is the refusal of the British Colonial Office to grant immigration certificates, which in turn causes countries to refuse a *laissez-passer* to refugees for fear that they may remain as charges on public charity.

It is not true that Jews are in the same dire predicament as the other peoples of Europe under the Nazi heel and therefore with them together wait for liberating armies. No other people is being exterminated systematically. The Jews alone are being utterly destroyed and with few exceptions.

Neither legal arguments nor appeals to reason, to the conscience of humanity, to British honor or to the proverbial British sense of fair play have made the slightest impression in London. Promises of collaboration by Palestinian Jewry and willingness to Jewry in new schemes of empire and reverence to the immensely valuable contributions made by Jewish Palestine in the military field, in agriculture and industry towards the winning of the war have been passed over in contemptuous silence by British statesmen and diplomats. Neither moral suasion nor political pressure,

ayers and supplications have been of the lightest avail. Nobody and nothing has been able to swerve the British government from its own imperialist designs in the Near East which involve the liquidation and demolition of the Jewish people's heritage. The death sentence on Jewish Palestine was pronounced in 1939. It was affirmed in 1944.

The British White Paper of 1939 was set, as Dr. Israel Goldstein, the President of the Zionist Organization of America, says on telling the Jews and the non-Jewish friends of Palestine in America, a monument of the appeasement policy of the Chamberlain Government, a left-over from the days of Munich and Godesberg, something that was accidentally overlooked by Winston Churchill when he joined house in the Tory Party and reversed his predecessor's policy of Anglo-German collaboration against the Soviet Union. The White Paper is the beginning, the initial measure in a new imperialist policy that is going to be applied with unflinching rigidity in the whole of colonial Africa. With that document the British Government inaugurates a policy of monopolization of the traditional areas of colonialism. Jewish influence, the democratic sentiment of Jewish Palestine is to be eliminated from the Near East. The Arabs are to be brought under direct British control. Pan-Arab federation is to be the nucleus of some sort of a new anti-Comintern movement in the Asiatic borderlands of the Soviet Union. French influence is and is to be still more radically curtailed in the countries of the Levant. America is to be involved into joining "the defense" of the British Empire in the future by looking after the oil wells which a British puppet, King Ibn Saoud, is now prepared to hand over to the American Government.

To tell the harassed Jewish people anything else is either childish naiveté or it is a sample of that appeasement mentality which Dr. Goldstein habitually charges the British Government falsely. The British Government is appeasing nobody. It is following a traditional imperialist policy of exploiting the colonial peoples. Jewish Palestine stands in the way. Hence Jewish Palestine must go and hence must go for the same reason. Britain is removing obstacles. The White Paper is one instrument to remove such ob-

stacles as the jockeying for position in World War III gets under way.

* * *

Unless there is a radical change of heart in London as a result of the ferment which is now beginning to operate in the British people and which manifests itself in more and more insistent demands that the real goal and objective in this war shall at last be made known and that it shall be commensurate with the agony mankind is suffering; that the imperialist state of international anarchy, the infamous status quo ante which produced the present world-calamity, shall not return in Europe where the Soviet Union is coming to stand guard against a return to the past, but not in Asia and Africa either where British influence holds sway; that the imperialist game of divide and rule through bloodshed, oppression and guile for profit's sake shall not start all over again and make war the permanent state of mankind, unless such a change comes about by the removal from the control-levers of international political machinery of Tory imperialists and their replacement by consistent democrats who will fight fascism and its twin sister imperialism wherever they survive or rear their heads, unless that occurs the prospects of Jewish Palestine are extremely dim indeed.

If such a change fails to come about there will not only be no Jewish Commonwealth established in Palestine at the close of hostilities, but much of what has been accomplished so far by the pioneers of the Jewish people will be liquidated. Instead of a larger volume of Jewish immigration into the Promised Land, a prospect which the Zionist leadership with its newly-discovered but mysteriously veiled "reasonable modicum of optimism" blandly goes on holding out to the cruelly-driven Jewish people, instead of that, Jews will be compelled to leave Palestine after the war if they do not want to starve to death. Economic circumstances are now being shaped in such a way that Jews will be forced to take up the wanderer's staff again in their own land and hie themselves to Ethiopia, Madagascar or Paraguay or, as Mr. Hoover thinks "perhaps to the uplands of Africa," wherever that may be, there to create a new minority problem by their presence and to await a new tragedy in a few years' time.

All this will come to pass if the permanent staffs of policy-makers in the Colonial Office and in the Foreign Office have their way, that is if the present policy of forcing the White Paper upon Palestine is followed to its logical conclusion. Against the determination to liquidate Jewish Palestine the infantile quips made at Zionist meetings by members of the leadership that there have been many white papers in the past and that they have all been overcome, are no defense or argument. In the first place it isn't true that former white papers were abrogated. Palestine feels their effect till this very day. And the present, more totalitarian White Paper of 1939, certainly is not being left to become a dead letter. It is being enforced now while the Zionist leadership and the Jewish people and its friends are being held in check by spurious invocations of military expediency and by references to a miraculous peace-conference that will settle all the ills of mankind, the Jewish problem included.

If the Jewish people and their friends accept this "provisionary" solution or rather that postponement of an open discussion by the rightful and competent authorities of the Palestinian question, the fate of the Jews is settled now. They are doomed. At an eventual peace conference, if ever it is held and if the future of mankind is not settled in camera by little committees of two or three, as the great problems of war and peace are settled now, the Jewish question and Palestine, I predict, will be placed at the bottom of the agenda. Interested foreign powers assisted by Kamasa and Bar-Kamsa in America, who have the ear of the Administration far more than the Zionists, will delay discussion as long as possible and ultimately will refer it to the Greek Kalends with what will then, alas, be a perfectly plausible argument: that there are not enough Jews left in the world to worry about.

Dark outlook? Hysterical spluttering? Anti-British propaganda? Not at all! The

situation of the Jewish people is desperate and is daily growing worse. Even the hope of liberation and salvation, which is left to all other peoples caught in the fascist hell, is being taken away from them. It is being taken away by the indifference and egotism of Christian nations. Right now, at this moment!

Should one then not protest now? When, pray tell, should one begin to protest; when the last Jew is slaughtered in the murdercamps of Rumania's Transnistria? I do not care one tinker's dam how much Hitler and Antonescu further dishonor themselves and their country. They are beyond appeal and beyond redemption.

But with England it is a different matter. We are England's friends and allies. The honor of Protestant England, the English of Wyclif, Ridley, Latimer, Wesley, May, Gladstone and Churchill, is as sacred to us as is the honor of Holland or France. We want England to remain great not by the sword alone, but by her spirit, the mother of the free, as the traditional protectress of the Jews. And we must therefore raise a cry of alarm and protest when we see British imperialists seeking to dishonor their country by taking a trivial advantage of the fact that the League's permanent Mandates Commission and the Court of International Justice, which proper concern Palestine is, cannot now be convoked to render judgment.

This is no more anti-British than condemning Jack the Ripper or some other criminal born on English soil. And if I am Halifax or whosoever seeks to make me crooked, appear straight by saying that moral considerations must sometimes give way to imperial interests, we refer him to that Jewish book of which he is said to believe the divine literal inspiration which stipulates that righteousness shall exalteth a nation.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE: *British policy towards the Assyrian people, Lebanon and France, and the Soviet Union's attitude towards a Jewish Palestine and a Pan-Arab federation.*

PEOPLE'S CHURCH

BEN RICHARDSON

THE ABYSSINIAN Baptist Church of New York City was born out of protest 136 years ago.

Black men grew weary of worshipping a fair-minded God from the Jim-Crow pews of the First Baptist Church in Old Street—a white congregation.

The inconsistency of the doctrine of common brotherhood preached from its pulpit and the persistent social, economic, and religious segregation practised against them by minister and members caused the Negroes of the congregation, who numbered more than twenty, to petition for the right to separate from the parent body and form their own church.

The informed and moving preaching of the Rev. Thomas Paul, a Negro who was invited to come from Boston to preside over the new venture, hastened the favorable decision of the white churchmen. Admission was granted and letters of friendly dismissal were given to "twelve elders and four brethren" who with five others made up the nucleus of the "New and Free" church. Property was secured in Anthony Street through the cession of the Ebenezer Baptist Church and on Wednesday, July 5, 1808, the little congregation was recognized as a Gospel body thereafter to be known as the Abyssinian Baptist Church.

Conceived in protest and nurtured by a bold program of Christian work, this church has enjoyed a steady and progressive growth through the combined ministries of Rev. Thomas Paul, Rev. William L. Brown, Dr. Robert Wynne, and Rev. Charles S. Morris.

Exactly one hundred years after the founding of the Church, another New Englander was called to its pulpit. The Rev. Adam Clayton Powell, Sr., a stalwart from that section of our nation that produced Jonathan Edwards, the Mathers, and Frelinghuysen, left his charge in New Haven, Connecticut, to accept the Abyssinian call in 1908. He brought to the congregation the combined gifts of fervent evangelism and sound, measured, business ability. Virginia Union University in Richmond had been his College where he had studied further at Yale. Thus

equipped, he started his incredible ministry.

Spiritually, Powell raised the moral level of the community and at the same time he amassed the greatest amount of real property and financial wealth the Church had ever known, and most of the money accrued was immediately put to effective use in the constant aid of those who had need—in or out of the Church circle. Powell caught and held the dream of moving the Church from its downtown or 40th Street location to its uptown or Harlem site. Clearly, prophetically, he saw that the Church of the future would have to be in the midst of the people's camp—the population trend was toward Harlem. Most of his members shared his dream. Some differed—violently, but all worked together and by June 17, 1923, the Abyssinian Baptist Church of 132 West 138th Street was a fact. The buildings, the Church proper, and the Community House cost in excess of \$334,881.86 and within five years after they were dedicated they were paid for in full. An Herculean task had been completed. The people had done it. The building committee comprised three immortals of the fellowship, Nelson Dixon, W. C. Cole, and William H. Marlow.

Under Adam Clayton Powell the Abyssinian Church became a symbol of service and a voice of intelligent protest for the Harlem community. Herodotus, the Greek historian, called the peoples of North East Africa "Abyssinians" or mixed people. He supposed and correctly so, that they were a racial admixture of Negro and Semite. The name is well applied to this Church. It is a mixed Church. Many currents run through its veins. It is modern in its Christian applications but fundamental in its doctrines. Its preachments run the gamut from pure rationalism to Pentacostal evangelism. For Powell the neighborhood was his parish and all of its people his charges. Black men, white men, rich, poor, priest and prostitute—all found in him a Pastor and friend. None were turned away or refused mem-

bership. The requisites were simple: a belief in God, Christ, and Man, was all that was asked.

During the depression years this Church fed thousands of hungry folk of all faiths, races, and shades of political belief. An employment service was maintained and crusades were launched to help youth in those difficult years. All the while the religious aspects of the Church continued apace and thousands came into the fold.

After 29 years of such useful and colorful leadership, the "Patriarch of the Negro Pulpit" surrendered his mantle to his son, who, called by God, chosen by the congregation, and endorsed by the community, wears it well to this day.

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., entered the full pastorate of this, the largest Negro Protestant Church in the world, October 13, 1937.

The succession was a natural one. Young Powell had been schooled in the shadow of the pulpit, academically prepared through college at Colgate in Rochester, and had completed Graduate work in Religion at Columbia University.

Adam Powell, Jr., inherited a well-organized Church with well over 6,000 members, three choirs, efficiently working boards, committees, auxiliaries, and a financial structure that bespoke the genius of his father and those who worked so long with him. But the son was not content to rest on the laurels of those who had gone before, so today his additions to the achievements of his father are as singular as were the feats of the elder.

Under the pastorate of the younger Powell the membership has come to exceed 10,000. The annual budget approximates \$60,000. Practically all of this sum is devoted to the vast community program. The Sunday School has over 1,500 pupils and 122 teachers. An adult education project trains grown-ups in allied subjects preparing them for further service in religious capacities. A Federal Credit Union gives banking and small loan privileges to members and operates with a capital of over \$70,000. The old age, sick benefit, and insurance needs of members are provided for through the Friendly Society, a chartered organization with a working capital of over \$75,000 in insurances.

Prior to the war there were six vestment choirs, totaling more than 400 voices. There are 28 paid staff workers who enjoy all of the benefits of ideal employer relations and receive wages equal to those of workers similarly employed elsewhere.

Since Pearl Harbor the Church has purchased \$45,000 worth of War Bonds and urged support of all home front win-the-war activities. The aged of the Church are further provided for in an Old Folks Home in Williamsbridge, where the complete maintenance is assured without cost. Camp and school scholarships are given deserving boys and girls. A Day Nursery cares for over 100 tots whose parents work away from home all day. The personnel of the nursery is professionally trained and is under the direction of Mrs. Julia Jones. Foreign Missionary aid includes the payment in full, of the salary of the Principal of the Suehn Industrial School in Liberia, Africa. A voluntary board of doctors under the direction of Dr. W. A. Freeman renders medical help to impoverished members and a similar group of lawyers led by Attorney Harrison Jackson does as much for those who have need of legal assistance. The program of youth recreation is one of the most practical aspects of the entire weekday work. Children are encouraged to come to the Community House to play, dance, and compete in various sports. This was the intent of the elder Powell when he contested the whole of New York's Negro Ministry in the building of it. The delinquency problem of the Harlem community owes much of its solution to this wholesome center under the able direction of Gwendolyn Jones and Acy Lennon.

The Sunday schedule includes the following regular services: a prayer meeting at 6 A. M., the main service at 10.45 A. M., vestry service at 11.00 A. M., and a night service at 8.00 P. M. The total attendance for the day averages 3,000 persons.

The pastor is a public servant. Chairman of the People's Committee, he guides an integrated organization of over 200,000 people represented by some 1,000 delegates. It is a non-sectarian, non-political, and non-racial phalanx of the masses. He edits the most virile Negro newspaper in the country, *The People's Voice*.

was the first Negro to be elected to the City Council of New York (1941) and has spearheaded every move to request, demand, and win the just rights of Negroes to equal employment, decent housing, and justice generally. His fearless leadership has made him a champion of the oppressed everywhere. The loyalty of his many friends will be demonstrated successfully when he runs for the office of Congressman of the United States this fall.

In order to be free to engage in the many civic and social efforts that demand his interest, Rev. Powell, Jr., had to find assistants who could carry on the work of the Church in his absence with efficiency and imagination. His office secretary, Miss Hattie Freeman, is the hub around which all clerical matters revolve. His personal representative and director of

religious affairs in his absence is the author, who is also Religious Editor of *The People's Voice*. The political guidance of the minister rests in the hands of one of the most astute politicians on the current scene. Joe Ford is without peer in matters of mass meetings, popular causes, and the allied science of public service.

The dynamic of the Church is twofold: it is a protesting Church and until the will of God is done among men it will be so. At the same time it is a prophetic Church determined to dream the dreams of a New World and to work without ceasing until it comes to pass. Negroes and whites make up its membership. Race and color are of no consequence. This is indeed a Church of the masses—dedicated to serve man, and therefore God.

* * *

As Paul Robeson reminds us, we stand at a crossroad. We either collaborate with the forces that are fighting Fascism in all its forms or we aid Fascism and pursue a path that will lead to disaster. The little people do not intend to go on accepting supinely the old "freedom." They have seen what a nation like the United States can do when it must fight external tyranny; and they believe that the world must make a similar effort to fight undernourishment, disease and unemployment. They may be silenced for a time when the peace comes. But they will not long maintain their obligations to the "democracies" if they do not receive the benefits. Nor will they tolerate placidly the old "Christian" race discriminations. The world is predominantly colored and these colored people are in the coming days going to challenge the old white bastions of privilege. They are going to walk up and share in the meaning of history, the pursuit of freedom. These people are a part of the new world that is already here and that is a-coming. Anyone who doubts this is simply ignorant of the live wire of leadership that reaches from Harlem to Chicago through Peking and Calcutta to Moscow. The vigor of this leadership will only be strengthened by people like Westbrook Pegler who think such leadership is too noisy and should be quiet. This new leadership and its following will make mistakes but many of these mistakes they will have learned from the "Christian" racists who believe in and have practised white supremacy. In short, the new world will be one in which there will be increased tensions. The peace will be a continuation of the struggle that brought about the war, the struggle between democracy and Fascism.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS
in *The Christian Register*

ANTI-SEMITISM IS A CHRISTIAN SIN

By W. ELLIS DAVIES

LIKE many of my colleagues in the Protestant ministry I had assumed that anti-Semitic outrages were spreading IN SPITE of Christian teaching. I was loath to believe that Jewish children were being beaten BECAUSE of Christian teaching. When first confronted with the astonishing facts about the root of anti-Semitism I was incredulous.

Of late I have discovered that a similar incredulity is characteristic of very many of my friends in the ministry. Paradoxically enough, their own sense of fair play, their elemental decency, inhibits their recognition of the appalling truth that the current spread of anti-Semitic violence is a direct result of Christian preaching and teaching.

For example, at a recent meeting of Protestant ministers brought together by the Textbook Commission of THE PROTESTANT for the purpose of organizing to combat anti-Semitism, a vigorous protest was made against the use of the words, "Christian teaching" in a resolution admitting Christian responsibility for the perpetuation of anti-Semitic attitudes. It was indignantly protested that such teaching is *un-Christian*, and that the resolution should be changed to read accordingly.

That this represents the authentic voice of the Protestant ministry there can be no doubt. The resolution to combat anti-Semitism in an organized manner was unanimously passed by large groups of Protestant ministers representing all denominations both in Boston and New York. Over 3,900 ministers have already signed the Pledge of the Textbook Commission To Eliminate Anti-Semitic Statements From American Textbooks.

The integrity of the majority of Protestant ministers is such that they simply take for granted that anti-Semitic teaching is un-Christian. They themselves are so free from race prejudice that they tend to be incredulous when they are told that Christianity is still a major source of the poison of race hatred.

Thus it is that the enormous significance of the Textbook Commission's pledge to smash anti-Semitism is not always fully

grasped. Indeed, it was not until after I became associated with the work of the Textbook Commission, particularly the diligent research of Conrad Meyer, that I comprehended the great, dramatic meaning of the pledge.

It should, therefore, be clearly restated that the inescapable fact is that anti-Semitism is promoted on a major scale by the teaching and preaching of Christendom. For seventeen centuries Christian teaching of a violently intolerant nature has been directly responsible for outrages against the Jewish people. Since the arrival of democracy in America religious intolerance, which is incompatible with the democratic spirit, has been uprooted from large numbers of Christian churches and the United States has remained a haven for refugees from persecution abroad. Yet the sinister truth is that not only has anti-Semitism remained in the teaching of many other churches, but that of late it has been substantially enhanced. Very many Christian institutions today, through the spread of anti-Semitic intolerance, are providing the United States with a bloodstained pathway backwards toward the unending years of Pogroms which blackened the European scene.

The Protestant ministers who have signed the pledge of the Textbook Commission would be greatly shocked by the letters we receive from a few of their colleagues who refuse to sign. For example, here is part of a letter from a Protestant minister in Illinois:

"That the Jewish people are suffering and will continue to suffer is not the work of men, nor even of the devil, but solely and directly of God . . ."

This quotation comes from a long letter in which the writer violently attacks the Jews for failing to accept the salvation of Jesus. He threatens and warns that because they remain Jews they will be persecuted "until the end of time." God is represented, not as the loving father revealed by Jesus, but as a terrible tyrant warning by implication,—accept Christ—or else!

A letter, gracious and pleading, urging that a loving God could not so afflict any group of His children, was addressed to this clergyman. In his reply he revealed the basic truth which is the presupposition beneath the work of the Textbook Commission. The following is what, in part, he wrote:

"But someday as you read the Old Testament which tells of God's dealing with those people (the Jews), and then particularly as you read St. Paul's letter to the Romans, there will come, in a flash, through the work of the Holy Spirit, an understanding which I'm not able to give. Or else, one day that will happen to me, and then things. But at the present time *I do believe that my viewpoint is the bible's own.*"

This disturbing letter, like others similar to it, bespeaks sincerity. The writer honestly believes he is supported by divine authority. He thinks that his anti-Semitic attitudes are inspired by the Holy Ghost. But the salient truth is, as the Research Department of the Textbook Commission has discovered, that in the particular denomination served by this preacher the textbooks are, for Protestantism, the most violent and abusive of the Jews. Like others of his colleagues, this Illinois minister has been poisoned by false and vicious misinterpretations of the Bible.

Fortunately, such views are not normally characteristic of the Protestant ministry. It is our experience that Protestant clergymen not only repudiate such interpretations of the Bible, but express themselves with consternation at the existence of anti-Semitism in Christian teaching. Their attitude, in general, to race prejudice can be likened to that of Jesus who vigorously opposed it. It should be remembered that when Jesus sought to illustrate love of the neighbor he purposely made a victim of racial prejudice, a Samaritan, the hero of His parable. Again when another racial outcast, a Syro-phenician woman, came to Jesus for help, He made capital of the incident to teach His onlookers a lesson in race relations. And the support which increasingly comes to the Textbook Commission indicates that Protestant ministers, for the most part, follow in the footsteps of their Master.

But I must repeat that I was myself until recently only vaguely aware of the current responsibility of un-Christlike Christian teaching for anti-Semitic outrages, and many of my colleagues in the ministry still remain unknowing.

During the recent outbreak of anti-Semitic violence in Boston the following words were uttered from a Christian pulpit:

"The Jews killed our Lord and the curse of God has fallen upon them. They said, 'His blood be upon our heads' and it was. By God's will they were destined to wander over the face of the earth as strangers among strangers, despised and persecuted; and so until the end of time, for the Jews killed our Lord and God's curse rests upon them."

These identical words are found repeated again and again in Christian textbooks now in use. The Research Department of the Textbook Commission has prepared a preliminary report consisting of eleven legal size typewritten pages of such quotations from various Christian textbooks. They are fully documented.* The quotations are representative, not alone of what is *read*, but equally of what is *said* in thousands of Christian institutions including churches, Sunday Schools, Parochial, Public Schools and Seminaries.

This, then, is the crucial issue: anti-Semitism is consciously taught to an alarming extent by those who profess to speak with the authentic voice of Christianity; and those who so teach must share the responsibility for the beating of Jewish children in the streets of our cities.

It is the intention of the Textbook Commission to demonstrate that those whose teachings are anti-Semitic may have political motives; they may aim at the transformation of our democracy into a clerical-Fascist state; they may stimulate anti-Semitism in order to manipulate the anti-Semitic vote; *but they do not speak with the authentic voice of Christianity.* The authentic voice of Christianity is found in the pledge signed by over 3,900 ministers.

* Available upon request.

WHITE STEREOTYPES OF THE NEGRO

By ARTHUR REX

THE WHITE MAN's stereotypes in regard to the Negro, that is, his common beliefs about what sort of a person the colored man is, are very interesting to the sociologist.

The trouble is, sociologists talk to and write for sociologists. Their books and lectures are reserved, as it were, for students and teachers of sociology and do not get to the mass of people. And they write in language understandable only to themselves.

A few sociologists cry out against this monopoly. Lester Ward, the greatest of American sociologists, wanted to bring knowledge and enlightenment to the common man. But those who came after him got too much interested in their own researches to give their knowledge to the common man.

One of the most revealing sociological researches on the Negro is *Deep South*, published by the University of Chicago. Four sociologists studied a cotton growing community from the ground up. They lived in the community and participated in its everyday life. They apparently did not intend to demolish stereotypes, but, intentionally or not, their findings upset a number of cherished beliefs about the Negro.

Let us, then, look closely at the leading stereotypes and see whether they can stand up under examination. We shall test eight of them.

Stereotype No. 1: The Negro is a sort of an ape; he has much of the wild savage in him.

This is the crudest of the stereotypes. White persons, when questioned after making such a statement, will say emphatically but hazily that the Negro looks like an ape. When pressed for proofs, they may add that his jaw juts out like an ape's jaw.

We have to thank the anthropologists for the destruction of this stereotype. They are specialists in the study of races. They note the bodily features of human beings, compare these features, and on this basis classify men into different races.

Taking our cue from the anthropolo-

gists, we will show that the white man is closer to the ape than is the Negro.

The first bodily feature we may note is thickness of lips. The Negro has thick lips. The white has thin lips. The ape, too, has thin lips. Therefore, the white is nearer the ape level.

Next, let us take texture of hair. The hair of the Negro is very short and frizzly. The hair of the white man is long and straight or wavy. As in the case of the white man, the hair of the ape is long and straight. Again, the white is closer to the ape.

Consider, now, hairiness of body. Negroes have very little hair on their bodies. Whites have much more bodily hair. Don't white men brag about the hair on their chest? Well, apes' bodies are covered with hair. Once more, we see how much closer to the ape is the white man.

All this shows how foolish it is to say that a certain race ranks nearer than other races to the ape or other animal level. One can turn the tables simply by using another set of physical characteristics. There is no proof that one race is higher than another on the evolutionary scale.

Stereotype No. 2: The Negro is thievish and dishonest, a natural-born stealer.

It is revealed in *Deep South* that white men steal from, cheat, and gyp colored people in wholesale and shameless fashion. Whites themselves admit this.

It is very common for white landlords to cheat their Negro tenants, who are cotton farmers, when lending them supplies and when paying them for their share of cotton.

According to statements made by two prominent whites, a large planter and a business man, stealing from and cheating Negroes is a good old white custom. In some way or other most landlords cheat their tenants. Some go so far as to take a colored man's last hog and chicken.

Such thievery has reached the point where it is said that the large planters steal half of what they make. The poor Negro tenant may be short-weighted on his cotton, given a fake bill of sale or a misleading check, or overcharged on his account

This landlord may lend him money that should be his as rightful payment for cotton raised and charge him 25 per cent interest to boot—charge him interest on his own money!

Landlords appropriate AAA payments due colored tenants by the device of arranging that the Negroes be regarded as share-tenants rather than cash-tenants even though they may pay cash rents.

It is evident from these samples that many tricks of stealing and cheating are in the white man's bag.

White fraud is backed up by white force. Not only do whites steal from Negroes but they beat Negroes up if they protest against the stealing!

Stereotype No. 3: The Negro is lazy and shiftless.

As a matter of fact, we learn in *Deep South* that Negroes are better and more reliable workers than whites, and whites themselves say so.

Moreover, most white landlords do no work at all on their plantations, not even the work of supervision. Negroes plow, plant, and harvest the land and Negroes supervise the work. Yes, Negro managers perform the highly responsible tasks of supervision.

Stereotype No. 4: The Negro is spendthrift and extravagant.

But we are informed that white landlords and businessmen promoted the buying of luxuries among their tenants during boom years so as to make large profits. They actually bragged about this promotion. The Negro was encouraged to buy anything from gold teeth to automobiles, and the very whites who brought on the splurge of spending condemned the Negro for his extravagance.

Here is repeated an old trick of exploiters, namely, to plaster stereotypes on an abused group in order to mask their exploitation. They force the exploited group into a bad situation and then blame them for the fix they are in. The blame is neatly clinched by slapping a stereotype on the group.

Stereotype No. 5: The Negro is ignorant, stupid, dumb.

The truth is that whites will not give the Negro in the South a chance to be well-educated. They see to it that Negroes get very little and very poor schooling.

Whites allow colored children only the most inferior school buildings, equipment, and teachers. Equipment that is freely granted to white children will be denied colored children. Educational funds will be diverted from Negro schools to white schools.

Whites withhold education from Negroes intentionally, in order to keep them from catching on to exploitation and fraud, to keep them dependent and submissive; in short, to hold them in an ignorant, slave-like condition. And, as one might guess, the Negro is thus easily branded as stupid and dumb.

Stereotype No. 6: The Negro can't do higher types of work; he just isn't able to do skilled work or managerial work.

We learn, however, that Negroes even in slave days did highly skilled work. It was largely their skilled labor that built the plantation mansions in the section of country studied in *Deep South*. Even today colored artisans hold an important position in the building trades of Southern cities.

In shops and mills colored workers will do highly skilled work that whites are supposed to do and get no credit for it, whether in status or in higher wages. Negro helpers, for instance, do the work of their masters even to the extent of performing the duties of a foreman; but the white "superiors" get both the title and the extra money which go with their reputed position, while the colored helpers continue to play their servile role and to draw their miserable wages.

As we already have noted, Negro managers completely and efficiently direct the work of tenant-farmers while the absentee landlords do no work at all.

Despite the land monopoly of the whites and many other handicaps, some of which previously have been mentioned, colored men by dint of hard work and good management have succeeded in buying land of their own.

Stereotype No. 7: The Negro is immoral, is sexually loose.

But if we look into this charge, we find that whites set the pace here. We find that the white man's exploitation of the Negro is sexual as well as economic and social. For the white man visits Negro prostitutes,

picks up Negro girls on the streets, has sex relations with his Negro servants, keeps Negro mistresses.

Things are so bad, we learn, that Negroes complain that white men have all the attractive colored girls.

Until recently, some fifteen years ago, we are told that one could see white planters riding with their Negro and white families in the same carriage. The colored family would sit in front with the coachman; the white family would be seated with the master.

White men, as we might gather, can with impunity have sexual relations with colored girls who appeal to them; but let there be even a suspicion of Negro men having sexual relations with white women, and the Negroes are punished with terrible brutality. Torture and lynching may be their lot.

Stereotype No. 8: The Negro is happy and contented, like a carefree child or a thoughtless savage.

This stereotype is especially useful since the whites may readily say, "See how happy he is; why change his condition?"

But the Negro spirituals and blues, cries from his very heart and soul, give the lie to this easy notion.

The commercialized blues of the night clubs and the kindred song hits of the day

are not Negro music. This sentimental twaddle is cheap counterfeit palmed off as blues for the entertainment of a stereotyped, ridden public. Colored singers and musicians must of necessity serve such trash fare to whites, for it is the only way they can be sure of a living. So they put on happy masks and give the public what it has been led to expect.

The real blues and spirituals are songs of misery and oppression, of defiance and revolt, of mockery and satire, of release and abandon. A people's soul gives out in these songs.

Listen, for instance, to the song of woe "Trouble," now available in record form in the album *Chain Gang*. Listen to "Southern Exposure," the song in which the Negro complains bitterly that the boss takes his crop and the poll tax takes his vote. Listen to "Defense Factory Blues," which utters the plaint of the Negro worker, refused a job at the defense factory, who asks for some democracy to defend. Both songs are to be found in the album of Jim Crow blues, *Southern Exposure*.

The history of the South during the so-called happy slave days is dotted with Negro uprisings and revolts. Neither in the past nor in the present do we find the Negro contented with his lot.

* * *

What with the now rising tide of anti-Negroism and anti-Semitism religious liberals have an opportunity within the American boundaries to show their mettle. If they can find new motives and means for genuine co-operation with American Judaism, if they can devise ways of eliminating the anti-Semitism and anti-Negroism that may be found in almost any gathering of church people, if they can find ways of abolishing the barriers of Jim Crowism in church and industry and social life, then they may claim to have the training requisite for work on a larger scale. Unfortunately, we have not had much practice in these matters. And we may be sure that if many religious liberals exhibit a sense of responsibility coupled with a passionate concern for justice, new divisions will appear, for old customs will be seriously brought into question and old privileges threatened. And these divisions will cut through the liberal churches as well as through other segments of society. "I bring not peace but a sword."

But religious liberals who believe in a religion that is prophetic and in a liberalism that liberates dare not desist in face of "religious" people or of "liberals" who do not want a new world.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS
in *The Christian Register*

DANGER SIGNALS IN ASIA

by TARAKNATH DAS

I.

IN THE HISTORY of international dishonesty and infamy, March 31, 1944 will go down as a date that will not be forgotten by any who have consciences and who advocate a single standard of international morality. On this date, with the tacit consent of the Government of the United States which did not protest, the British White Paper on Palestine, shutting the doors of Palestine to Jewish Immigration, came into effect. This happened in direct violation of the Balfour Declaration and the promise of Britain as a mandatory power to the League of Nations. This violation of the solemn assurance given to the Jewish people and the world at large was carried out by the British government in league with the Arab feudal barons, on the pretext of military necessity; and the hollowness of this pretext is clear to the leaders of THE PROTESTANT (see van Paassen's series now running in THE PROTESTANT). This infamous act of shutting the doors of Palestine to the Jews has been put in motion at an hour when the remnants of European Jewry now in the Balkan countries are being threatened with extinction by the Nazi monsters!

The following developments may be expected:

Reactionary Pan-Islamist Moslem leaders will be encouraged to carry on pro-fascist, anti-democratic and anti-Jewish activities in the Near East and North Africa. They will spread the poison of reaction in India too. The anti-Semites all over the world—in Britain and the United States in particular—will regard British betrayal of the Jews as a signal for greater ferocity for their cursed activity, born of religious intolerance and ignorance. This means a new tragedy for Humanity. The leaders of the United Nations who have silently approved British policy in Palestine are directly responsible for this grave possibility.

II.

For more than two and one half years, since the Japanese conquest of Burma with the support of anti-British Burmese nationalists (for details read Jack Belden's *Re-*

treat with Stilwell), I have on repeated occasions warned the leaders of the United Nations that unless the Indian problem is solved on the basis of Freedom and Justice, there might arise a crisis in India which could seriously hurt the cause of the United Nations. "It cannot be over-emphasized, I said, that without the active support of India, as well as of Soviet Russia and China, the United Nations cannot win the war. Indian support is needed to check the Axis onslaught on the Near East and the Middle East. India has contributed heavily in men, arms and materials toward defeating the Axis in the Near East and Africa; and Indian soldiers are fighting on the Cassino front. Nearly a million Indian soldiers are now fighting for the United Nations outside of India. Unless China receives the fullest support of the Anglo-American powers *through India*, Japan may destroy China's offensive power. India is the important pivot. The United Nations must fulfill their obligations and at the same time strengthen their moral position in Asia by joining with a free India in the fight for world freedom." (June 1942 THE PROTESTANT).

One year after the Quebec Conference, when it was heralded that the Burma Road would be re-opened, we are told today that the Japanese and Indian Nationalist army of Subhas Chandra Bose, who has established with Japanese support the provisional government of the Republic of the United States of India at Singapore, has invaded India and is threatening to cut off the supply line of General Stilwell's American and Chinese armies who are fighting in the jungles of Burma behind the Japanese lines.

If the Japanese continue to gain in India during the coming few weeks and succeed in controlling even a part of the province of Assam, cutting the communication lines between India and Burma, it will affect the situation in India as well as in China most unfavorably. We are convinced that the support of the Indian people, led by Indian leaders of the type of Nehru and Azad, in cooperation with the Anglo-

American-Chinese forces, is the only thing which will be able to check the political propaganda of Subhas Chandra Bose and his followers, and defeat Japanese military operations. The Col. Blimps of India will not be able to rally the Indian people. It is about time for President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and General Chiang Kai Shek to urge Mr. Churchill to release anti-Fascist Indian political leaders from prison and give a solemn guarantee for Indian freedom.

III.

Recent Japanese surrender to Soviet Russia of coal and oil concessions in Northern Sakhalin Island which would not have expired until 1970, and the signing of the Soviet Russian-Japanese Fishing Agreement for five years have been interpreted in many ways by various experts who think that a Japanese-Russian war is inevitable. It seems that until the Anglo-American powers attack Nazi Germany in the West, Soviet Russia will not pursue a policy which will lead to a Russo-Japanese hostility although there are signs that she is already anticipating such a course.

It has also been reported that Japan has withdrawn five divisions of her crack troops from Manchuria and is preparing to attack North China. It is quite possible that this

attack will begin within a few weeks, at about the time the monsoon will begin and when the Japanese would feel secure in Burma. China, completely cut off from India, will not receive from the Anglo-American powers an adequate supply of arms and ammunition which will be needed to crush the Japanese in the impending struggle, and they will have to depend upon the available supply from Soviet Russia. But, as is indicated by the recent border incident between the Mongolian People's Republic and the Chinese government in Sinkiang, and also by the growing lack of cooperation between the Chinese Communist government in the Northwest provinces of China and the Government of General Chiang Kai Shek at Chungking, it is becoming increasingly apparent that Soviet Russia may be reluctant to extend military aid in any form to the Government of General Chiang Kai Shek. Thus the Chinese government at Chungking may be faced with a new crisis, affecting the interests of the United Nations.

The above facts are danger signals in the Near East, India and the Far East. If these dangers are not averted now by wise statesmanship, the United Nations will have to pay heavily for their ultimate victory.

BOOKS RECEIVED

WAR AND EDUCATION, by Porter Sargent, Porter Sargent, Boston, \$4.00.

AVALANCHE, by Kay Boyle, Simon & Schuster, \$2.50.

FREDERICK BOHN FISHER, WORLD CITIZEN, by Welthy Honsinger Fisher, The Macmillan Co., \$2.50.

THE CHURCH AND THE LIBERAL SOCIETY, by Emmet John Hughes, Princeton University Press, \$3.00.

THE WORLD WITHOUT NATIONS, by Arthur Freud, The Hobson Book Press, \$2.00.

TRUTH TRIUMPHANT, by B. G. Wilkinson Ph.D., Pacific Press Publishing Assn., \$3.00.

DER FUEHRER, by Konrad Heiden, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, \$3.00.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND ECONOMICS, by Thomas Garth McBride, Richard R. Smith, \$3.00.

FREEDOM FOR ITALY, by Gaspare Nicotri and Franco Nicotri, Italian American Press.

THE VATICAN AND THE WAR, by Camille Cianfarra, E. P. Dutton & Co., \$3.75.

BATAAN: THE JUDGMENT SEAT, by Allison Ind, The Macmillan Co., \$3.50.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE OBERAMMERGAU PASSION PLAY, by Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf, Rayner Publishers, Philadelphia.

ROME STOOPS TO CONQUER, by E. Boyd Barrett, Julian Messner, Inc., N. Y.

THE AMERICAN WAY—Selections from the public

addresses and papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt, edited by Dagobert D. Runes, Philosophical Library, N. Y.

THE RAVEN . . . A NOVEL OF EDGAR ALLAN POE, by Chancellor Williams, Dorrance and Co.

A CENTURY WITH YOUTH, by Sherwood Eddy, Association Press, N. Y.

THE TRAGEDY OF EUROPEAN LABOR, 1918-1939, by Adolf Sturmthal, Columbia University Press, \$3.50.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, by Creighton Lacy, Association Press, N. Y., 50 cents.

A HANDBOOK FOR THE WARTIME CAMPUS, published for the National Student Committee of the Y.M.C.A.s with the endorsement of the War Emergency Council on Student Christian Work, Association Press, \$1.00.

TVA-DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH, by David E. Lilienthal, Harper & Bros., \$2.50.

EUROPE, RUSSIA, AND THE FUTURE, by G. D. H. Cole, The Macmillan Co., \$2.00.

ROAD TO FREEDOM, by Leo Pinsker, Scopus Publishing Co., \$1.50.

SCHOOL AND CHURCH, by Conrad Henry Moebius, Harper & Bros., \$2.50.

DREAMS COME TRUE, by Charles R. Brown, The Macmillan Co., \$1.50.

THE RADIANT LIFE, by Rufus M. Jones, The Macmillan Co., \$2.00.

A GUIDE FOR THE BEDEVILLED, by Ben Hecht, Charles Scribners Sons, \$2.50.

BREAK WITH FRANCO!

By LAWRENCE FERNSWORTH

ITALIAN FASCISM was wind in the sails of German Nazism. And these two, in their turn, made it possible for fascistic movements of one kind or another to gain headway in other countries of Europe—Spain not the least among them.

All the Spanish Republican and revolutionary groups saw this. In the civil war they knew they were fighting not only against the spread of fascism in Spain, but for the restoration of the principles of popular rule in Europe. A popular triumph in Spain would have strengthened the popular movement in France. It might have averted this war.

Though the Spanish people saw this clearly, the political key men of the democracies did not. And so they pursued a course which fatally led to the destruction of liberal government in Spain, and so in turn led fatally to war.

The success or failure of our good neighbor policy and of its major objective, hemisphere solidarity, hinges on our policy towards Spain. Clearly there will be no hemisphere solidarity so long as there exists in Spain a well protected and well nourished focal point of infection whose sole purpose is to inject the anti-democratic virus into the bloodstream of our neighbors and to poison them against us. Let there be no doubt that this is the purpose of the fascistic regime existing in Spain today under Franco.

This fascist regime is not supported by the liberty loving Spanish people. It is supported, sad to say, by the democracies; by our own State Department and those who inspire it.

The blind obstinacy of this State Department has pushed it headlong from one disaster to another, until now, in Latin America, it seems headed for the greatest disaster of all.

Evidence grows that the seizure of power in Argentina forms part of this new Axis pattern. Helen Fuller, in the *New Republic* admonishes:

"The Good Neighbor policy and Pan-American unity will have to be sharpened if they are to serve as our weapons against the new blitz forming to the South."

Manuel Seoane, in *The Nation*, says of the Bolivian affair:

"This success is undeniable evidence of the failure of the United States policy toward Latin America—evidence which no diplomatic cleverness will cover up. It proves the futility of trying to maintain cordial relations with dictatorships which have no internal support, and which may be destroyed overnight despite benedictions spoken in Washington.

"The second step in the creation of a grand fascistic alliance in South America has been successfully carried out. And now the third act of the conspiracy is in preparation. The agents of Argentine Fascism are active here in Chile, but it is in Peru that they have the most immediate chance of success."

And yet we hear the argument that we must not give democratic movements in Latin America encouragement, lest we thereby place ourselves in the position of intervening in the affairs of neighboring countries. Let us examine this argument in the cold light of reason.

1. Is this not to concede an advantage to the enemy at the outset? The promoters of Fascism have never been deterred by any such considerations of delicacy. They have been aggressive and insolent in their intrusions upon the political life of all countries, including our own. They have selected the fields whereon to fight the ideological battles of this war. But we, out of what is called delicacy, are asked to decline battle.

2. This kind of false delicacy will never hearten democracy. It is badly informed or it would know that what the masses of these countries really resent is the insolent intrusions of Fascism, and that what they would welcome is aid in throwing it off.

3. How can it be argued that we are interfering with their countries, when we are merely encouraging that kind of government which they themselves profess? Not even Argentina or Brazil have gone so far as to openly avow democracy.

4. To strike our colors anywhere when we are engaged in a war wherein democ-

racy is the issue, and the cause for which men are dying, is not compatible with keeping faith with those who fight and who die in this cause.

Just how sadly our Good Neighbor policy has failed in the eyes of the people of South America was told by an Argentine gentleman speaking before the Foreign Policy Association in Boston quite recently. He said:

"The Argentine was greatly disillusioned by the failure of the democracies, and of the United States in particular, to help the democratic elements of Spain during the civil war. This fact has greatly destroyed United States leadership in the eyes, not only of the Argentine, but of neighboring countries. In the face of this failure they resent the United States efforts to preach to them about democracy through pamphlet and poster and radio. Some even go so far as to say that it smacks of hypocrisy."

And when the United States continues to flirt with dictatorships in their lands at the very moment it preaches democracy, their resentment is merely intensified, he explained.

This is one of the tragedies of our good neighbor policies—that South Americans do not think we are qualified to lead them along liberal ways.

They well know—what our own key politicians do not seem to know—that Spain has been a satellite of Hitler ever since Hitler and Mussolini accomplished the downfall of the Republican government and handed it to their puppet, Franco.

Ever since the intrigues were begun to overthrow the Republic, Spain has its assigned role in support of the Axis, namely, to work for the Axis in Latin America. That role it has fulfilled, and continues to fulfill, before our very eyes. In furtherance of this role, Spain has made every Spanish consulate in the United States, in Latin America and elsewhere, a center of Nazi espionage. The part played by Hitler, working through Spanish consulates, in swinging Bolivia to the Axis, should surely open the eyes of the most blind.

And all these developments lead directly to the Spanish Falange. Recent days have seen a significant development in Spain with respect to the Falange. The

new Spanish budget more than trebles the amount to be spent this present year for the Falange's activities—from \$15,400,000 as of last year, to \$47,500,000 for this year. At the same time the educational budget is cut from \$44,000,000 to \$17,000,000. No doubt the plan is to step up education towards the cultural and political improvement of South America—from the Spanish fascist viewpoint.

Let it not be for a moment forgotten that this Falange, which aims at extending Spanish influence once more over Latin America, is directly under German control and works in close collaboration with Gestapo agents. It is directed by George von Snitzler, chairman of the German dye trust. The plan is to have a fascist post-war Spain as an escape corridor from Germany to Latin America.

What will the gain be for us, we may ask, to have defeated the Germans where they live and in their occupied territories, and to have beaten Japan to her knees in the Far East, if we shall have to fight them again in our own hemisphere?

What we must do about Latin America is clearly a question of what we must do about Spain. It is there that our Good Neighbor Policy must begin. For a Fascist Spain will inevitably mean a Fascist South America. And a democratic Spain can mean nothing else than a rebirth of democracy on our South.

Let us make a good neighbor of Spain and our worries about having good neighbors below the Rio Grande and below the Equator will be closer to solution.

The Republic of Spain was no swash-buckling set-up of would-be conquistadores seeking to re-establish new empires. It desired nothing more than to live in friendliness with its neighbors and play its assigned role in maintaining the Mediterranean peace. It was the only important European country which by the implications of its constitution adhered to the League of Nations. In that constitution it adhered to collective security and renounced the solution of international conflicts by force of arms.

It is time to break off relations with Spain. It is time to recognize Franco Spain as the enemy it always has been. To recognize that it has engaged and still engages in battle—and so to give battle.

IS FRANCE DOWN FOR THE COUNT?

By PAUL PHELPS MORAND

THE VARIOUS combinations projected by the Anglo-Saxon powers for the post-war world treat France, for the most part, as an unimportant country, one to be relegated to the past. This seems to be the viewpoint held, consciously or unconsciously, by the Anglo-Saxon world and by the United States in particular, by the American press and even by the universities, as well as by the man in the street whom these influence. And all this is based on information as accurate and on thought as mature as those which convinced the Washington experts that the Russian army would not be able to resist the Nazi assault for even as long as the Greek army had withstood it.

France is certainly not powerful enough to remain isolated from the rest of the world, nor is she any longer strong enough to pursue the policy of the Little Entente which surrounded her with satellite armies. She needs friends and allies and—though Washington and London do not believe this—she is in a position to choose them. As Edgar Ansel Mowrer says, France will not lack proposals of marriage.

But instead of beginning by analyzing what France wants, it will be better to inquire what the countries that are stronger than she are looking for, and what they can offer her. Three possible solutions suggest themselves: A world federation, an entente with Russia or an entente with the Anglo-Saxon nations.

I. WORLD FEDERATION. All these problems would, obviously, be solved by a perfectly organized world federation in which each country would hold a position comparable to that of the forty-eight States in America today. If I believed such a federation would surely come into being I should be able to stop writing this article at this point. But recent developments in connection with Poland, General Smuts' speech and Churchill's address concerning his unwillingness to preside over the liquidation of the Empire, and the imperialistic attitude of Washington, Wall Street and the great corporations towards Latin America—all these indicate that it would be more prudent not to view this perfect federation as an imminent certainty.

II. ENTENTE WITH RUSSIA. Huge and strong though she is, Russia is realistic, and knows how to recognize danger. After the first World War she saw the governments of the three victorious countries meddle in her internal affairs and attempt to strangle her. Some of her soil was ravaged and some of her villages burned by expeditions financed by London, Paris and Washington. These expeditions failed, but left Russia more impoverished and suffering deeper wounds than right after the World War. Almost immediately afterwards the Polish army attacked her, advancing into Russian territory. Hurlled back to the gates of Warsaw, it was saved by the aid of Weygand and Poland then pushed her borders hundreds of miles, at some points, beyond the line Lord Curzon had assigned to her. Thus a series of artificially created states—Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, all surgically amputated from Russian territory, and the Finland of Baron Mannerheim and his Mannerheim Line (which was not built with Finnish money alone)—threatened Russia with invasion and forced her, an arch-foe of militarism, to develop her Army. The aggressive *cordon sanitaire* policy naturally caused corresponding tendencies in the Kremlin, such as manifested themselves in 1939 and 1940 by the occupation of a vast defensive zone extending from Estonia to Bessarabia. This precaution proved insufficient and the Reichswehr, after assuring itself of the slave labor of the rest of Europe, succeeded in reaching the gates of Moscow.

A policy of friendly alliances with adjacent countries, or one of annexation, is thus necessary for Russia—but it may prove insufficient. The Reichswehr will be defeated, of course. But it was vanquished in 1918, only to be rebuilt with the encouragement and financial aid of the Western nations. Have these nations changed? Yes, you will answer, as they are now at war with Germany. But they were at war with her in 1914-18; and their governments represent the same social strata as financed Hitler, supplied the Mikado, encouraged Mannerheim and continue to support Franco, The House of Savoy, and

Flandin. The Kremlin knows that the Reichswehr can be rebuilt under the indulgent eyes of the cartels. They also know that what the Reichswehr fears most of all is a second front. Not a front such as a few divisions have now established in the distant South of Italy, but one on Germany's Western border—at Verdun. If such a Western front, active and powerful, had been a certainty at the time of Munich, the second World War would not have broken out and fifteen million Russian soldiers and civilians would not be dead today. An alliance with France, such as one existed between the reactionary governments of Poincaré and the Czar, therefore regains great importance for the peaceful future of Soviet Russia. But such an alliance cannot be reliable and permanent unless the French government of tomorrow is anti-Fascist.

From the French point of view, the outstanding fact to be remembered is that for many decades the constant concern of any Frenchman thinking of foreign policy was the formidable army on the other side of the Rhine. And elementary prudence demanded an alliance with the country which had an army on Germany's other side, no matter what the nature of its government. In Czarist times the French Republic, whose official representatives delivered so many speeches on liberty, was closely allied with the Czar—whose Cossacks bloodily suppressed every libertarian movement—since the real power in France lay in the hands of industrialists and bankers who would have liked to treat their own peasants and workers in Czarist fashion.

In 1914, then, that military alliance was in working order. But when, two decades later, Laval signed a similar entente, the result was not a Marne victory, but Munich. The ruling classes of France were more afraid of Stalin, over a thousand miles away, than of Hitler—within firing range. This does not mean that the great majority of Frenchmen did not prefer France to Germany. But the patriots were unorganized and unsuspicious, lacked the will to act. The pendulum of their will hung lamentably equi-distant from Fascism and anti-Fascism. From the viewpoint of action France was equal to zero. Then, on Pétain's invitation, Hitler came to Paris

and everything changed. The pendulum was brutally pushed to the right. As a practical measure for keeping it there hostages were shot, workers deported and patriots hunted down like wild animals. In the flame of fury and suffering the French soul was forged anew. As soon as the Reichswehr shows the first signs of cracking the pendulum will swing in the opposite direction and in its rise will take with it the great mass of the French—all except the two per cent who became traitors. But these two per cent are the ones whom London and Washington want to save at any price, for if they lose these they will lose their bridgehead in Europe. It is needless to say that the true interest of America demands that these traitors and friends of Hitler be hanged. If this is done, as seems probable, there will be no more Pierre Laval to prevent the functioning of an eventual treaty with Russia. The Russians know this, and have faith in France. But if those two per cent are kept alive and make another attempt to seize power—no peace or happiness will be possible in the world.

III. ALLIANCE WITH THE ANGLO-SAXONS. What do the present Anglo-Saxon governments have to offer the French to prevent them, once regenerated and liberated, from reaching an understanding with their natural ally? In 1918, instead of giving France the Rhine as her border, they offered her their promise to come to her aid, after which Wilson's successors lost all interest in the security of France. At the outbreak of the present war England, with a greater population and greater wealth than France, sent over an army smaller than that of a little country like Belgium; and at Dunkirk that army took to its boats, leaving France to stand between her traitors and her foes. When Paul Reynaud offered to transport the government, the still intact French fleet and the remains of the army to Africa if the United States would send planes, Washington's reply was frigid. And so Pétain was enabled to sign with Hitler.

When General de Gaulle resolved to resist nevertheless and eventually reconstructed a real government with an army and the remnants of a fleet, London and Washington were quick to decide to take away his power to give it first to Darlan, France's Public Enemy No. 2, and then

to Peyrouton, the creator of French concentration camps. Some de Gaulle sailors were imprisoned in New York for excessive patriotism. The Underground saw itself refused, day after day, the hand grenades and sub-machine guns needed for its unequal fight against the Vichy government and the Reichswehr. And later General Smuts declared that France had lost all importance.

In France herself there is great admiration for the Russian people, for their self-sacrifice and indomitable resistance and for their army. The knowledge that in their own country the Soviets liquidated the Russian counterparts of the Michelin's, Wendels, Lavals, Peyroutons and company arouses no antagonism in the breasts of patriots who are starving while the Two Hundred Families of France grow rich at their expense and dine with the representatives of Goering. After the purge which France needs so badly, a Franco-Russian alliance will no longer meet any serious objections in France.

What would this mean for the rest of the world?

If these two countries had any imperialistic intentions they might well be a formidable threat. But since Napoleonic times no one has suspected France of a desire to conquer any European territory, while Russia's attitude emerges clearly from her pact with the Czechs and her offer to Poland and to Roumania. After her defeat of Finland she could easily have annexed that country entirely, as it had belonged to her before Versailles. If she did not, it must be because she preferred not to bite off more than she could chew or to go where she was not wanted. Obviously she

has no desire to acquire by force new citizens who would be hostile to her.

This is the static side of the picture. Is there another, a dynamic aspect of actual benefits to Europe and all the world?

The first benefit—enormous despite its negative nature—will be the disappearance of Fascist power in Europe. The Fascists cannot be powerful unless Germany is capable of launching an attack. Sandwiched between a regenerated France and a victorious Russia, however, the Junkers will have to keep quiet—or even disappear entirely. Most probably every European country will be influenced by one or the other of these two countries. For the Balkans the Russian influence is indicated, except in Roumania, which may prefer the Romance influence, and in Yugoslavia, where the two cultural spheres meet without any cause for conflict. In Italy, the Low Countries, Spain and Portugal the direct influence of Russia will probably be very slight. Involved here is the question of language, customs and traditions, in which these countries are very closely allied with Paris.

All these countries will tend to have the same type of government, one elected by the people. Customs barriers will tend to become lower. Huge armies will become useless, since these countries will not be able to attack one another or launch an assault against the Franco-Russian alliance. After two or three difficult years prosperity will set in and rapidly increase, but wealth will no longer be so unjustly distributed as to leave some families in poverty while others enjoy ostentatious luxury and tyrannical economic power. To some this may sound Utopian. But it is merely a prognosis based on the historic manifestations of the tendencies of the Soviet leaders.

*

*

■

Good reason has Scotland to be proud of Knox. He only saved the Kirk which he had founded, and saved with it Scottish and English freedom. The Covenanters fought the fight and won the victory, and then, and not till then, came the David Humes with their essays on miracles, and the Adam Smiths with their political economies, and steam engines, and railroads, and philosophical institutions, and all the other blessed or unblessed fruits of liberty.

FROUDE

HAS CHRIST A VICAR IN THE CHURCH?

By METROPOLITAN SERGEI

[The following condensation of Metropolitan Sergei's article in the Moscow Journal, cabled by Raymond Arthur Davies at our request, is significant not only because it presents a theological point of view from the head of Greek Orthodoxy, but because it provides new evidence of the re-vitalization of the Christian religion in the Soviet Union.]

THE MAIN DANGER from which the Lord Jesus prayed to preserve the Apostles and their followers was not the evil that awaited them in a hostile world, but that this world should not entice them with its distractions nor lead them to betray the truth. The world hostile to Christ not only must be expected to attempt to extinguish the light of Christ with every kind of persecution and other external means. The world must also be expected to attempt to penetrate within the very ship of Christ and find servants for itself even among the Christ-appointed guardians of the Church, so that with their hands God's deed may be destroyed.

By what path and by what means will the small flock of Christ, parted from its lord and teacher, now emerge victorious from so dangerous a contest? In what lies the guarantee that the gates of Hell shall not overpower the Church of Christ?

The Roman Catholics give this question a classically clear and definite reply: the Lord Jesus Christ, departing to His father, entrusted the earthly church to the Apostles and all believers to His vicar, the Apostle Peter, who became Bishop of the oecumenical capital, Rome, and endowed the Apostle with the extraordinary power of infallibility in the decision of problems of faith and church regulation for the whole universe. From the Apostle Peter, first Bishop of the Roman See, the post of Vicar of Christ with all its powers and extraordinary rights passed directly to the Roman Popes who direct the earthly church, sinlessly guarding in her the truth of Christ and with their infallible authority repulsing the efforts of the gates of Hell to pervert her.

Let us agree that this teaching concerning the Church on Earth is expounded by the Roman Catholics with winning harmony. They represent the Church as the wisest organization most excellently adapted to the resolution of the mundane problems which will confront her.

But from the Gospels we learn that the Lord Jesus Christ bodily departing from the mundane world did not at all mean to renounce His care of His church. To the contrary, He definitely promised the Apostles He would be with them until the end of ages to assist the observance in the Church of all He preached to the Apostles. This is how our Church understands the words of the Lord; and our Church sees in this constant companionship with her Lord the guarantee of her invincibility before the gates of Hell.

In the light of apostolic teaching concerning the actual unity of Christ the Holy Father with His body—the Church—any arguments about vicariates in the Church in reality become unthinkable. One may speak of this only to the extent that we regard the Church as a man-made organization even though with heavenly tasks. In the foreground here is administration, and for administration it is not important from whom the orders come so long as the given individual has the appropriate powers. But taking into consideration apostolic teaching, to speak of replacing Christ by anyone else is not only unacceptable but is not without considerable blasphemy for the sensitive Christian conscience.

Even theoretically it is impossible for the Church to imagine anyone in place of the Lord; this would be abandonment of, treason to her sole bridegroom and savior. The brightest expression of complete devotion to the Church of Christ are undoubtedly the female martyrs and hermits. It is known that certain of these reached ecstasies in worshipping the heart of Jesus and stigmata in reliving the sufferings of Christ. Could they have attained to this had they divided their heart and attention between Jesus Christ and his mundane vicar? This is a psychological impossibility.

Beside the moral untenability in principle of the doctrine of vicarage, from a

factual viewpoint, not even an angel, not to speak of a man, could replace the Lord God for the Church body. The Church belongs not only to the earth, but also to heaven. But man is "earth and ashes" and on earth is only a brief guest and moreover, is subject to constant changes.

The truth is, in practice, that every group of individuals in order to accomplish planfully and successfully some public deed, usually is headed by someone in the capacity of a leader. Apparently in this direction the organization of the Church developed historically and externally. The primary cells, the small but factually independent bishoprics gradually unite into groups until they form five patriarchates side by side with which appear great unions in the form of national churches. At the head of each church unfailingly stands one of the Bishops whom the rest of the Bishops of the group must honor as head and do nothing exceeding their powers without his approval. Perhaps it would neither disturb nor counter the described course of church development if sometime a single leader or representative would head the Universal Church in the capacity, for example, of chairman of the oecumenical council, not as Vicar of Christ, of course, but solely as head of the church hierarchy.

Whether the development of church life shall ever bring forth such single leadership we do not know. Nor shall we forget the danger of concentrating oecumenical power in the hands of one man, subjected to all sorts of temptations. Even admitting that the one man leadership in an administrative respect might benefit the Church, still we must not forget that the word of man is not the word of God. The Lord leads His church along a way known and acceptable to Him alone and this way does not always coincide with the ideas of human wisdom.

Not giving the Church in charge of others, the Lord alone until the end of ages remains at her head, and to propagate the Gospels and to direct the Church flock He sent into the world Apostles and according to them and after them their successors—the orthodox Episcopacy. The Bishops, though they occupy pulpits unequal in importance and service, are all endowed with equally abundant gifts and are connected by the Union of Life into which

there may not steal the haughtiness of worldly power. This basic principle of church structure (the freedom of churches and their agreed collaboration in the observance of Christ's teachings) found excellent expression in church history in the harmonious system of church management in the above-mentioned grouping of churches with single leadership of each group. But the same church history warns strictly against placing special hopes upon the externals. It is enough to recall the names of Nestor, Dioscorus and others like them who headed patriarchates or the Roman Popes of latter days. Whole peoples, once shining with orthodox belief, famed for martyrdom and asceticism, but now fallen away from the Church remain sad mementos of the human imperfection of the system despite all its wisdom. As a Godly establishment with ultra-mundane tasks the Church cannot exist solely by human means and human wisdom. Therefore, the Heavenly Father does not leave the life of the Church without His direct interference. Just as He sent judges and prophets to ancient Israel, so too, in moments of adversity He usually sends to His church individuals endowed with exceptional gifts as prophets, powerful in faith and spirit. Having no official position these people step forth from the common mass and become leaders of others. But this leadership bears no official character, has no official church capacity and is not always confined within the framework of church service. As all prophecy, this is the personal deed of these people, the deed of their personal initiative and jealousy of the Lord and the Church of God. Being temporary, and as it were, accidental, such deeds do not give the doers any rights to direct the church or to take one or another hierarchical pulpit.

At the very dawn of church history, when it was necessary to establish the brotherhood and to lay the foundations of the churches in various lands came forth the Apostles Peter and Paul: Peter for Christians of the circumcised and Paul of the uncircumcised. As we see from the Book of the Apostles, Saint Peter then acted with the initiative of a true leader. Nevertheless this opened not for him the road to occupation of the sole, then-exist-

ing position in the Church, that of the Bishop of Jerusalem: that post was taken by Saint Jacob. In the same way Saint Paul placed Bishops in charge of churches and entrusted his pupils to do likewise, but he himself occupied not any permanent pulpit.

Outstanding prophetic leaders arose in the Church during the centuries. And it is to be noted that these leaders of the Church were not necessarily important Bishops of important main cities but Bishops of small places or not even Bishops at all.

In that way, under the favorable shelter and nourishment of her heavenly supreme Bishop and Head, the labors and efforts of the God blessed host of sainted Apostles, Fathers and teachers, our Holy Greek Or-

thodox Church begun in the east and spread throughout the world and in all countries and among all peoples glorifying the Holy Trinity in all languages for so many centuries, until now without mundane head and master, safely upholds the Holy Greek Orthodox faith entrusted to her by Christ, and undeviatingly leads its flocks to eternal salvation. We believe that even unto the end of ages Christ will not deprive His church of His blessed presence and during days of trial will, as heretofore, continue sending to His vineyard worthy leaders, "guardians of the House of Israel," so that they too, having done their deed, might shine forth as heavenly bodies in the bright image of the Holy Fathers for whom the Church glories Christ.

* * *

Which way liberal religion will go can be determined only by the religious liberals. We would like to think that religious liberals will strike out across "religious" and racial boundaries and thus make common cause with religions that are not Christian and with people who are not gentile or "white." Certainly, insofar as the Christian churches maintain an imperialist and superior attitude toward other religions the strife is, in our shrunken world, bound to increase. But little confidence should be placed, on the other hand, in liberal proclamations for a world faith or a world religion. International conferences at which people aspire to save the world by chanting that it is good to be good and that we are all going in the same direction, do little more than distract attention from the real work in hand.

The unity of world religions and of the peoples of the world will, like world political organization, acquire reality and stability only insofar as economic and social structures and dynamics give it support. And for religious liberals this means that the decisive question is not so much whether they can exhibit an attitude of tolerance and reachableness in face of other religions. That alone is much too easy. The decisive question is whether religious liberals can effectively assist in the organization of economic and political power for the liberation of the underprivileged and the oppressed who are struggling for a new world of shared natural resources and of justice for all.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS
in *The Christian Register*

OFFICIAL PROTESTANTISM AND SOVIET AIMS

by HARRY F. WARD

IT is impossible to know what Russia wants. The little we do know about her demands we don't like." The Chairman of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is speaking. The assembled ministers of Greater New York are listening. They are hearing the voice of the official leadership of American Protestantism. It is repeating a journalistic myth—the Russian enigma, the sphinx in the Kremlin. Through a moral judgment made without the easily accessible facts it is reviving in the minds of its hearers the distrust created by years of lying propaganda. Thus it is weakening the collaboration it proclaims to be necessary for the winning of the war and the securing of a stable peace.

There is a sufficient record in the Geneva archives of the general international aims of the Soviet government. Then as now they were dictated by its needs, which are equally the needs of other nations. Three times they went to disarmament conferences. The first time they proposed universal disarmament. They got derision. The second time they offered fifty per cent. They got the run around. Returning the third time with the same proposal they withdrew it in favor of the American suggestion of thirty-three per cent and got the double cross. On the day of decision the American delegation voted with the British against their own offer. After the Soviet Union joined the League, on every possible opportunity, its spokesman Litvinoff proclaimed the need of collective security and offered the collaboration of his government in making it effective. Consequently the Soviet Union is more explicit on this issue than those nations who have only accepted the principle under the pressure of recent events and those who have not yet made up their minds about it.

The Polish-Soviet Agreement of December '41, later broken by the fascist faction who dominated the cabinet after General Sikorski's untimely death, speaks the same language as Federal Council leaders concerning the kind of organization needed to effect collective security. "... a just and durable peace can be achieved only

through a new organization of international relations on the basis of unification of democratic countries in a durable alliance. Respect for international law, backed by the collective armed force of all the Allied states, must form the decisive factor in the creation of such an organization."

The Soviet signature is on the Atlantic Charter and the Master Lend Lease Agreement whose general principles were long proclaimed by progressive Protestants before they were subscribed to by governments. On the record that signature, as our diplomats who have had dealings with the Soviet Union have told us, is one hundred per cent good. Three times since those documents were signed Stalin has set forth Soviet war aims in more explicit terms. At succeeding celebrations of the Anniversary of the Revolution, with diplomats and foreign correspondents present, the cable and radio have carried his words to the ends of the earth.

On November 6, '41, after "Our first aim is to liberate our territories and our people . . ." there is reiterated emphasis on the same point. "We have not, nor can we have, such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples . . . We have not, nor can we have, such war aims as the imposition of our will and regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their own lives on their own lands as they see fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations."

On November 6, '42, Stalin said that the peace settlement must include: "Abolition of racial exclusiveness; liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights; the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes; economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in maintaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties; destruction of the Hitlerite regime."

On November 6, '43, with the light of victory beginning to break on the horizon, Stalin said there was coming on the agenda "the important questions of the organizing and rebuilding of the state, economic and cultural life of the European peoples." He declared: "The policy of our government in these questions remains unchanging," and put the common tasks of the Allies briefly under five heads. The first two reiterate again the declarations of '41-2 concerning liberation of the peoples of Europe and granting them "full right and freedom to decide for themselves the question of their form of government." The next two call for the stern punishment of the fascist criminals for "all the crimes they committed," and the establishment of "such an order in Europe as will completely preclude the possibility of new aggression on the part of Germany." The fifth task expresses more strongly than before the aim of mutual aid. "Establish lasting economic, political and cultural collaboration among the peoples of Europe based on mutual confidence and mutual assistance for the purpose of rehabilitating the economic and cultural life destroyed by the Germans."

In these consistent statements of general aims there are two additions to the Atlantic Charter. One is the demand for stern punishment of war criminals no matter in what country they may hide. Like Soviet penology this is preventive not vengeful in its nature and has been adopted in a personal statement by Roosevelt and Churchill. Is our Protestant leadership going to say it doesn't like this? The other addition is "Abolition of racial exclusiveness." This raises the Negro question, the Jewish question, the question of white supremacy, exploitation and cultural repression in Asia, India, Africa, Malaysia and the islands of the sea. Are those whose gospel proclaims the spiritual equality and unity of all races going to say they don't like this? Knowing there can be no just or durable peace until the race conflict is ended, are they going to lie down before our fascist minded white supremacy fanatics? Or are they going to start the difficult task the Soviet Union has accomplished internally with its diverse races and tongues, the

translation of the principle of equality in economic, political and cultural fact?

On this record the only ground left for those Protestant liberals who say they don't like what they know of Soviet demands is the position that Soviet actions belie Soviet words. They certainly did not in their support of self-determination in Spain, China, in Yugoslavia. It was united front peoples' governments they helped, not communist soviets. But our objectors mean boundaries and in particular Poland and the Baltic states. Bessarabia and Soviet Karelia are in the same category but nobody seems to be concerned about them. They have no voters here offering the prospect of a bloc to politicians hungry for office. They are not, like Poland which now has the spotlight, of prime concern to the Vatican. It is on this point of Soviet western boundaries that the whole of reaction—the counter-revolution and the counter-reformation—combines to support Hitler's last hope of splitting the Allies, and if that cannot be done to aid his supporters and would-be successors in wrecking post-war collaboration. It will be an historic catastrophe of the first magnitude if any considerable section of our Protestant forces should play into their hands through ignorance of the facts, misled by papers who leave out or bury in the back pages what their owners do not want the readers to know and by politicians who read into the *Congressional Record* the utterances of reactionary, imperialist, Polish American organizations and never a word of the counter statements of labor and liberal groups of the same blood.

There is no clearer revelation of what the monopolistic, imperialistic period of capitalism has done to our political morality than the general treatment of the Soviet-Polish boundary question. The basic fact is beyond dispute, is freely admitted by the Polish imperialists themselves. By invasion they took the territory in question from the Soviets in the day of their weakness. They wanted more. They took more and had to disgorge it. They still want more: "A Poland from sea to sea." What they took was inherited by the Soviets from the Kerensky regime, to whom it had been awarded by the Allied Supreme Council because the population was predominantly non-Polish. The line was laid down by the Curzon Commission; it fol-

wed roughly the ethnographic frontier and received our tacit approval. Yet most of our discussion of the issue assumes or implies that the Soviet Union is taking something away from Poland. To the Soviet Union, and in fact, the territory in dispute is not Poland but Western Ukraine and Western Byelo-Russia, colloquially White Russia. What Poles there are have come by infiltration and colonization. In a book written a year after the seizure the Polish foreign minister says "we took our surplus lands to colonize our surplus population." He should have added "and to give our landed nobility more cheap peasant labor." Concerning any small sections where Poles predominate the Soviet offers adjustment, but the Polish peasants will have something to say about that.

The issue is not primarily one of territory but of people. It is a question of uniting kinfolk who have been torn apart. The ethnic standard cannot be absolute in settling boundaries in this migratory world, but in a case of contiguous kinfolk the ethical imperative is clear. The Soviet journal, *War and the Working Class*, organ of the labor unions which the Executive Council of the C. F. of L. says have no voice nor function of their own, recently said: "The Polish imperialists took advantage of our temporary weakness to steal the ancient lands of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples." Note the emphasis. Ever since those lands were taken Stalin has said from time to time, "We do not want a foot of territory that belongs to others. But some day we will get back our own." He is thinking more of people than territory, of people who will then get back their lands, be able to reap where they sow and inhabit what they build. These people won their freedom once, when their kinfolk won theirs. Then it was taken away from them and they were thrown back under the most tyrannical and exploiting landlordism of all Eastern Europe. Now their freedom to use their labor to develop their lives and their children is on the way back to them. Who that believes in justice will say them nay? Surely our Protestant leadership is not going to repeat on a world scale the tragic blunder of Luther on the peasant question.

In the resolute stand of the Soviet Union on the boundary question there is no en-

croachment upon the free and independent Poland which Stalin told Ralph Parker of the *New York Times* in May '43 the Soviets unquestionably wanted. He added that the relations between the two states could be either neighborly with mutual respect or the Poles could have an alliance of mutual assistance if they wanted it. Furthermore the Soviet-Czech treaty on which Benes who has had sufficient experience to know what he is doing, places most of his hope for the future security of the Czechoslovakia Republic, contains specific provision for the Poles to come in if they want to. All that the Soviet Union asks of the states which join borders with it, as its publications constantly state, is that they be "friendly neighbors." This means they want security from the plottings of fascist or fascist controlled governments. If we need that in Argentina and Bolivia, how much more do they need it in Poland, Finland, Rumania, they ask. President Roosevelt correctly said there is no right to choose fascist governments. The need for collective security precedes and limits the right of self determination.

War and the Working Class has just written: "The Polish people must find in their own midst new constructive forces capable of drawing lessons and pursuing a line which will be free from the fatal errors of the past and capable of correctly understanding and honestly serving the true interests of the Polish people and a free, independent and democratic Poland." It cannot understand what leads people here to see in that attitude a design of intervention and dominance. When our liberals, speaking the language of imperialism, charge the Soviets with seeking spheres of influence, it replies "We need no spheres of influence. We seek no vassal countries." There speaks both pride and principle.

Soviet people and Soviet leaders rely upon something stronger than imperialism. After Stalingrad turned the tide of battle and the Soviet armies started westward Stalin spoke a word to the people who had long been waiting for it: "Brothers, the day of your liberation is at hand." To those in occupied Soviet territory, liberation from the brutal Nazi army; to those taken out of the Soviets in the

'twenties, liberation from the poverty and ignorance imposed upon them by exploiting landlords and capitalists. Here is like calling unto like. The union of workers, peasants and socially minded intellectuals in the first socialist state in history is calling to its own who were cut off from it. There is more speaking than the bond of a state, or nationality, or blood kinship, or even the solidarity of the workers in the class struggle. This is the unity of those who work and hope and suffer in a common cause that embodies the needs and aspirations of all mankind; the unity of those engaged in a creative enterprise that is more than a state—a community. When this bond is well and truly fashioned those who try to break it will themselves be broken against it.

The same bond binds the people of the Baltic States to the people of the Soviet Union. During the last world war they too made their revolutions, set up their soviet power, and joined the infant Russian Federative Socialist Soviet Republic. They were taken out by intervention and fifth column collaboration when the Western powers created a cordon sanitaire around the Soviets. First under British influence, then in the German orbit, they soon became fascist. Lithuania got the next dictatorship in Europe after Mussolini. Before many years Latvia and Estonia started repressing workers' organizations and leftist political parties and stopped having elections. In '39 the Soviet Union gave the people the opportunity to vote, as soon thereafter they gave it to the Western Ukrainians and White Russians who also had been living under a dictatorship. These people, with over ninety per cent of the electorate voting, decided to go back where they had formerly belonged. The Baltic peoples, by about the same majority, elected popular assemblies which, after widespread discussion voted on grounds of national security, economic and cultural development, to petition the Soviet Union to admit them. This was done after amending the Soviet Constitution because they are not yet full socialist republics. The same peoples' government remained in power until Hitler invaded their countries. The Baltic peoples, like the Western Ukrainians and White Russians and the democratic Poles

have strengthened the Red Army with many volunteers. So something is added to the Soviet position: "It is a matter of honor to protect our own."

To those liberals among us who raise the question of the Atlantic Charter relation to these matters Soviet public relations reply that legally and morally it is no more relevant to them than to Texas or California. The better answer is that the results achieved are actually those sought by the Charter, the people get the kind of government they great majority want. They go back to those from whom they were forcibly separated. Is the Atlantic Charter to become articles of receipt for stolen lands and peoples? What deep prejudice or unrecognized interest is it that subverts the moral judgments of religious leaders to serve the ends of those who by cunning deception seek to make the Atlantic Charter a house of refuge for another second string fascist robbers and killers in Europe?

A number of our liberals and a section of our press, all with axes to grind, are raising the cry of unilateral action against the Soviet Union, despite the fact that Churchill recently affirmed that the Soviet position on the Polish boundary has the support of the British government and rests on an Anglo-American decision of 1919. In the days of the Kerensky regime each of our four diplomatic authorities who passed judgment on the question of the Baltic States concluded that their future was best assured as part of a Federated Russia. The main consideration is their position as an outlet for a considerable section of Russian foreign trade. In view of the economic strength of the Soviet Union it is still truer today that their development lies in the direction they have chosen to go. The climax of distortion in this discussion is the question raised here by William Henry Chamberlain, and in Britain by the opponents of Churchill, of whether another Munich is being pulled off with Stalin being appeased in place of Hitler. To make the restoration of its own people to the Soviet Union equivalent to the rape of Czechoslovakia is the prize example of what prejudice and venom can do to the intelligence and the moral emotions.

The injection of the Atlantic Charter and unilateral action into this question is an irrelevance, save for the possible conse-

quences in disunity. Is the Red Army to sit down on the '39 frontier and wait for the Allies to decide what they will or won't do to help it free and restore its own? "But the vote was not free; the Red Army was there." Yes, the Red Army was there, and if it had not been there, there would have been more Jews and "non-cooperating" peasants, with their wives and children, in mass graves, more of their youth in forced labor in Germany, more of their girls in Nazi army brothels. In the Baltic States the political prisoners would still be rotting in the jails, if they were alive. The Red Army attacked no inhabitants. The dictators, their supporters and dependents, ran away and the people took hold and managed their own affairs. This they could not do until some force stronger than the fascist terror was there. What else are we supposed to occupy Europe for?

On this point the mind of most of our Protestant leadership does not meet the Soviet mind because ours is thinking in terms of abstract principles or historic rights of possession while theirs is thinking concretely in terms of people and their present needs. This is the basic consideration that determines their action which therefore implements the peoples' choice. The Polish treatment of their national minorities, not to mention the Jews, became an international scandal when they broke their obligation to report to Geneva on the subject. Their best lands taken, denied schools, the Western Ukrainian and White Russian peasants sank into poverty and ignorance. In '38 a Polish paper reported some of them reduced to using wooden plows. They were subjected to punitive expeditions and sentenced by military field tribunals. After their liberation by the Red Army in '39 they got land, live-

stock, tractor stations, universal education, self-government. The Polish national minority enjoyed the same rights. The Baltic States, at a higher level of commercial and industrial development, recorded a marked expansion of employment, industrial, agricultural and cultural equipment, during the short period of their return to Soviet association before the Hitler invasion.

There is another consideration for those who seek a just and durable peace. It cannot be attained as long as the Baltic States could be used as a springboard for another attack on the Soviet Union. All hope for it would vanish if non-Polish nationals could again be put under the heel of the most romantic and inefficient imperialists left in Europe, who still make maps putting their borders on the Dniester or the Don and write articles about a Poland extending from the Baltic to the Aegean and Black Seas. In putting an end to this menace, as in its larger achievements, the Red Army is an instrument for effecting a just and durable peace. Therefore our religious leaders should welcome its cooperation in realizing their aims. Their guarantee is the principle by which the Soviet Union is bound together—voluntary affiliation. Laid down by Lenin, it has been reiterated for twenty years by Stalin in all his speeches concerning the multi-national state which has stood steadfastly united through such a storm of destruction as no other modern state has endured. On this principle the people of the Soviets rely for the future world organization. As Stalin put it in his lecture at Sverdlov University in April '24 "... communism knows that the union of the nations in a single world economic system is possible only on the basis of mutual confidence and voluntary agreement. . . ."

* * *

The sense of equality, above all else, gives the system of government in Russia its democratic character, despite very much that seems to us to be undemocratic in the working of its political institutions. As against this, the absence of equality, or the sense of it, largely destroys the democracy of the Western parliamentary countries, despite their formal acceptance of universal suffrage.

G. D. H. COLE

in *Europe, Russia, and the Future*, Macmillans

THE NAZIS USE THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

By HENRY R. CASSIRER

IT HAS lately become the fashion to question United Nations foreign policy by applying the yardstick of a one-sided interpretation of the Atlantic Charter. When it comes to the future of Poland or France, to the way Germany is to be treated after the war, the Atlantic Charter has become the platform on which to criticize Soviet, British or American policy. This platform has even become the rallying point for 70 members of the British House of Commons who seek clarification of Churchill's policy, not of course toward India, but toward the European Continent.

This is a dangerous enterprise. Not because the aims of the Atlantic Charter are in conflict with the best interests of the American and British people. But because some advocates of the Charter distort its meaning, fall into the pitfalls of its contradictions, and exploit its generalities to beat the positive core of allied strategy by concentrating on its imperfections.

The first to realize the advantages in using arguments allegedly based on the Charter to divide and embarrass the United Nations were the Nazis. This should make us ponder, particularly when its present enthusiasts have never shown great support for collaboration with the Soviet Union, or great anxiousness to realize democratic principles of equality, self-determination and economic welfare in their own countries.

Take a typical broadcast to North America on November 21, 1943:

"The history of the world moves forward. Starving Indians played a role, so did Arabs working for low wages, Estonians and murdered Poles. The Polish people were sacrificed, so were the Serbian people and the Norwegian people. Where the Atlantic Charter had to stand the test, in the occupied—or as the Allies say, the liberated-countries, there it failed completely, in North Africa, in Sicily, in Southern Italy . . .

"The Atlantic Charter remains only good enough for speeches on holidays. . . . It became a piece of good manners. This it could have remained but for

Moscow, which did not care for nice illusions and rudely asked for power and domination over the small nations. The mask has been dropped officially. The race for objects of exploitation needs no more camouflage."

The conception of the Atlantic Charter which this Berlin broadcast seeks to impress upon its listeners obviously is a distorted one. It concentrates on the third point of the Charter which says the British and American governments "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them," and tears it out of its context. In fact Berlin is careful not to quote even this point, but simply seeks to make us believe the Charter was an affirmation of the right of self-determination of small nations pure and simple.

Rather than dealing with point one at this stage of the war ("their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other") the Nazis are now concentrating on problems within the borders of the allied powers at the time the Charter was proclaimed in August, 1941, on India, the Baltic countries, the Western Ukraine. The issues concerning the Soviet Union are stressed primarily, in line with present Nazi strategy, and a broadcast to Asia on December 7, 1943, said for instance:

"Roosevelt and Churchill have the impertinence to claim that their cause is just and they are fighting for freedom and democracy. They have even produced an Atlantic Charter. Finland however, is test of British righteousness and justice. All slogans of freedoms and fights against aggression and what not are hypocrisy."

American policy is attacked in a similar vein. Broadcasting to the American continent, the German-controlled Vichy radio denounced United States Imperialism in South America on March 30, 1944, and added:

"Argentine, Paraguay, Bolivia are all giving proof of their common outlook. What better argument could they have

for their policies than the defense of the Atlantic Charter? But the Anglo-Americans, with their Soviet friends aiding them, don't worry much about logic."

The Nazis were quick to realize the contradictions of the Atlantic Charter, contradictions which exist only if you approach present-day problems in the formal and legalistic sense so often useful to the enemies of true freedom. That is why they seek to disrupt an anti-fascist postwar world of security and well-being by playing up the "self determination" of reactionary governments, by raising issues concerning the territorial status of the Great Powers, before 1941, especially when they affect the Soviet Union.

How directly this kind of approach can benefit fascism is evident from a Vichy broadcast which said (11/16/43):

"They proclaim themselves liberators and declare that they will leave all nations the right to choose their own governments. But we have proof of the contrary. It is essential, says the Moscow communique, that the Italian government become more democratic. . . . Thus Italy can choose the government she wants, as long as it is one which the three powers like and the Moscow leaders can do what they want in the country. This freedom of action should make the people of France reflect a little."

The Moscow conference, the greatest step forward toward that peace free from fear and want promised in the Atlantic Charter, actually was denounced in the name of that Charter by American Isolationists and by Vichy which said (Dec. 2):

"Thus it would seem that London and Washington are not able to conciliate promises made to the various governments in exile with the demands of Soviet Russia. One can imagine the apprehensions of the small nations in view of a reactionary movement in Great Britain and the United States in face of the Soviet claims at the Moscow conference.

"By one concession after another the Anglo-Americans sacrifice the small nations to Soviet Russia, and the Atlantic Charter, which expressed the general policy of England and America, has become invalid even before it has been in force."

The greatest violators of human freedom and national independence dress themselves up as the defenders of the small nations and the Atlantic Charter, hoping thus to ward off the blow which is to crush them forever. Similarly American friends of foreign reactionary governments and enemies of a world free from fear and want wave the Atlantic Charter as a flag under which to oppose present United Nations policy. It is not accidental when the German-controlled Paris radio noted on March 11, 1943:

"American public opinion is being prepared for the definite scuttling of the Atlantic Charter. Senator Wheeler declared to the American Senate that there is no doubt, that it is even most probable that the Soviet Union will dominate Europe at the end of the war if she is victorious over Germany. . . ."

And on January 21, 1944 Berlin noted in a broadcast to North America:

"The American Senator Nye declared yesterday, in reference to the Atlantic Charter, that the Charter was buried at the bottom of the sea like Roosevelt's document about the Four Freedoms."

The reason why the Charter can be thus misused appears to lie less in its shortcomings, serious though its contradictions are, than in the shortcomings of our foreign policy, and our inclination to fall for reactionary policies if only they are dressed up in democratic generalities.

If allied foreign policy were consistently and aggressively democratic, its opponents would appear as barefaced reactionaries, no matter in what garment. A policy squarely directed toward the overthrow of General Franco and the support of Spanish anti-fascism, a policy giving full support to the democratic forces among the French, a policy aiding and stimulating to the full the democratic forces in Italy or Poland, may be attacked in the name of the defense of national self-determination. But such an attack would pale in face of the fact that only an "interfering," aggressive policy can undo all earlier fascist interference and bring true self-determination, true freedom from fear and want to the peoples concerned.

THE INTERNATIONALE OF REACTION

TRIUMPH OF TREASON, by Pierre Cot, Ziff-Davis Publishing Company, Chicago, New York
432 pp. \$3.50.

Many books have been written on the subject of the fall of France and on the underlying and contributing causes that led to the military disaster of 1940. But this book by Pierre Cot, who was the ministerial associate of Briand, Painlevé, Blum and Daladier in the government of France during the most decisive years of contemporary history, is the first document to emanate from what may be called an official source. It tells the full, the awful and distressing truth.

"Triumph of Treason" establishes beyond any peradventure of doubt that the so-called *haute bourgeoisie* in France, i.e. the upper classes, big business, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the military command and their corrupt journalistic hangers-on preferred a military defeat, the dishonor of their country and the enslavement of the French people by a foreign fascist Power, not to a Communist regime,—for Communism was never the issue—but to a moderately liberal and progressive democracy.

They brought in Adolf Hitler deliberately for no other purpose but "to put an end to all this democratic nonsense," as General Weygand wrote frankly of the Popular Front in the *Mercure de France* as long ago as 1937. They brought about the defeat of their own country because they were afraid of a victory for democracy in Europe.

And the chief weapon they used in France against the normal evolution of democratic institutions was the same weapon that is being used today in America by prelates, big businessmen, by the columnist-pontiffs and by the more vulgar fascist rabble-rousers. They used the red, Communist smear in and out of season and against everything and everybody, periodicals, movements, labor organizations, churches and individuals connected with or aspiring to genuine democracy. In France, as in America, the red smear was and is virtually the sole argument, formula and metaphor furnished to destroy the democratic regime and the hope of the common man.

Although M. Cot mentions America but briefly, and does so only in connection with the sinister Darlan-Boisson-Peyrouton episode, in which he shows American statesmen to have been the dupes, but the willing dupes of French fascism, his book sounds a grave

warning to this country. France was prototypal of the United States in that the general political situation in this country shaped up along approximately the same lines as it did in France before the capitulation to fascism. We have our Cagouards, our Jewish baiters, our deliberate confusionists, our carters yearning to do business with anybody no matter who and no matter how, our "liberal" journalists who draw in their horns the moment they detect a controversy in the office or when a decision must be made, our big press which regrets that we did not maintain "an honest neutrality" instead of going to the aid of Britain and Russia and who blame Roosevelt, the Jews and "the internationalists" for plunging us into war as their correspondents French numbers blamed Blum, Cot and Daladier for sending the soldiers of France "to die for Poland."

As a sample of "liberal" confusionism and evasiveness on a matter of paramount importance I cite The New Republic's review of this very book by Pierre Cot. The reviewer declares in summing up that M. Cot attributes the fall of France among other things "to the moral disunity of the French people." M. Cot does nothing of the sort. He does in fact the very opposite.

M. Cot shows that under the Popular Front which had the support of 90 per cent of the French electorate, the French people were more solidly united, of a deeper unanimity of spirit than ever before in their history. Under the Popular Front administration, production rose in France to a level never before attained by any previous government in spite of all the lies about strikes and social unrest that were spread at the time in this country by the *Klassegenossen* of the two hundred families in France. Had the Popular Front remained in power the French would have fought like the Russians: on the Seine, in the streets of Paris, on the Loire, in Orleans, in the *rédoubtée* Breton, on the Gironde, in the Pyrénées and in North Africa. For in that case they would have had something to fight for.

It was precisely that French national unity under the Popular Front which the Pétain-Weygands, Laval, De Wendels, the bankers, the munition trusts, general staff and the church feared so much that they handed the country over to Hitler.

The title of M. Cot's book is therefore

sense misleading: Pétain and Company are not traitors. They were and remain intensely loyal to their class. They fought the class struggle to a logical conclusion. Private interests came before the fatherland. The internationalism of reaction, which is far more real than the internationalism of democracy, revealed its solidarity in 1940 as it revealed its solidarity in 1870 when Bismarck handed the defeated Thiers the artillery to shoot down the Commune of Paris and in 1919 when Clemenceau shipped fifty thousand machine guns to Moske and Ebert to crush Spartacus.

It is no wonder that Admiral Leahy and Mr. Bullitt remain till this day the good friends and admirers of that grand old man Pétain. Not blood, but common class interests ill.

This is a valuable book to be kept on hand for the days to come when the France of the Popular Front which has been reformed in the crucible of suffering will reappear upon the scene and will speak again in the councils of the nations.

Pierre Cot in writing down this *extrait* of his personal history has not only well deserved of the French fatherland, but also of the human fatherland, which is democracy.

PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

THE TRIUMPHANT 13, THIRTEEN AGAINST THE ODDS, by Edwin R. Embree, Viking Press, N. Y., 1944, pp. 261, \$2.75.

It has been done before and now it has been done again. The Negro population of the United States exceeds 13,000,000, yet in all recent attempts to prove the worth of the race as a whole, the same 13 persons have been paraded before the eyes of Negroes and whites as though they alone were the standard bearers. Edwin R. Embree for the past fifteen years has been the President of the Julius Rosenwald Fund and is a serious student of Negro life in America. He writes as though he knows his characters well enough although he did not select those to be discussed by him. The unfortunate element in this case is that everyone else knows them too. Therefore nothing vitally new has been added to the body of fact about Negroes in this country. Until someone takes to writing about some of the numberless Negro greats who have not had the benefit of publicity, all Negroes will have to be epitomized by Walter White, Marion Anderson, A. Philip Randolph, William Grant Still, Langston Hughes, Mordecai Johnson, W. E. B. DuBois, Richard Wright, Mary McLeod Bethune, Charles Johnson, Paul Robeson, Joe Louis, George Washington Carter et al. . . . all of these are truly great per-

sons but they have been sorely overworked by well-meaning but slightly informed authors.

BEN RICHARDSON

A HANDBOOK OF FRIENDSHIP, GET TOGETHER AMERICANS, by Rachel Davis-DuBois, Harper Brothers, N. Y., 1944, pp. 182, \$1.75.

No lasting solution to the problems of racial and cultural differences can be found unless the basic grounds of simple friendship are securely set down. People who laugh and sing and play together can come to be fast and understanding friends. Within this framework projects can be conducted to develop mutual inter-cultural respect and appreciation. This is not the way of the theorist. But the actual practice of this method has convinced Rachel Davis-DuBois of its value. She is a social scientist and is concerned with pragmatic proofs. Dr. Davis-DuBois records her demonstrations of how personal association ameliorates the disturbances that arise between folk of variant cultures and social strata. This is a valuable book. It is simply and happily written and will prove priceless as ammunition on the social front now and in the days of reconstruction after the war.

B. R.

WHAT RUSSIA WANTS, by Joachim Joesten, New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944, Index. Pages 214. Price \$2.50.

THE ROAD TO TEHERAN. *Story of Russia and America 1781 to 1943*, by Foster Rea Dulles, Princeton University Press, 1944, Bibliography. Index. Pages 279. Price \$2.50.

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES, by Pitirim A. Sorokin, New York, E. P. Dutton, 1944, Index. Pages 253. Price \$3.00.

I.

Joachim Joesten, Assistant Editor of *Newsweek*, and anti-Nazi, German-born prospective American citizen, in *What Russia Wants*, gives us an excellent summary of the present trends of Soviet Russian foreign policy. This policy is based upon the ideal behind the Soviet Russian Revolution, and also clearly enunciated by Marshal Stalin in his significant speech of November 6, 1942, when he threw light on Soviet Russian war aims:

"Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered, and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration

of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime."

To be explicit, Soviet Russia's policy toward her neighbors can be termed an application of "good neighbor policy" or Soviet Russian "Monroe Doctrine," which may be interpreted as follows: Soviet Russia is not interested in territorial expansion at the cost of any of her neighbors, but to further her national security she is interested in having neighboring governments friendly to Soviet Russia. She will not tolerate, if it is within her power, any anti-Soviet state at her borders in Europe or Asia. This fundamental policy of U. S. S. R. is not very different from that of the United States toward her neighbors. Soviet Russia will insist upon applying this policy in her dealings with Finland, Poland, Germany and the Balkan States, as well as with China and Persia.

II.

Foster Rea Dulles, a veteran American newspaperman with wide experience in world affairs, in *The Road to Teheran*, discusses lucidly American-Russian relations from the days of the American Revolution to the Teheran Conference. The main thesis of this excellent work is as follows:

The real reason for American-Russian peace, an unbroken peace between two great powers, has been the absence of conflicting interests. "Their interests have been very much the same and threats to those interests have arisen in the same quarters. In the nineteenth century a common rivalry with Great Britain drew the United States and Russia together, and in the twentieth century the direct challenge of Germany and Japan has made them close allies." He proves this thesis conclusively, baring the diplomatic history of the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Crimean War, the American Civil War, the Russo-Japanese War, the World War of 1914-1918 and the present World War. The author comes to the significant conclusion that, "America and Russia have survived dissension and controversy and conflict in the past. Our traditional friendship has not been based upon sentiment and casual gestures of good will, but upon each nation's realistic appraisal of its own interests. . . . *The road which led to Teheran should in future link Washington and Moscow even more closely.*" (p. 261).

III.

Prof. Pitrim A. Sorokin, born of Russian peasant stock, formerly professor of Sociology and Law in the University of St. Petersburg, imprisoned by the Tsarist Government for

his revolutionary activities, once a member of the Kerensky Government and also imprisoned by the Soviet Russian government, is now Professor of Sociology at Harvard University. In *Russia and the United States*, he says that Russians, being Slavs, are not different from the people of the United States in their fundamental outlook of life and their social institutions—family life, local self-government, religious and spiritual life. They are neither aggressive nor war-like as some people are given to understand. On the contrary they are peace-loving and appreciative of the cultural values of other peoples. They have made very important contributions to every phase of world culture and are bound to become one of the most vigorous and progressive nations of the world. While condemning revolutionary excesses in destruction of life and property, and purges, Prof. Sorokin holds that what happened in Russia was merely the violent phase of the Russian Revolution. (All revolutions had their reign of terror of some kind.) According to Prof. Sorokin, Soviet Russia several years ago passed the period of terror and was already moving toward a harmonious cooperation among the peoples to recreate a better social order, when the present war was imposed upon her by the Nazis. He vigorously defends Soviet Russian foreign policies.

Prof. Sorokin emphasizes the necessity of the spiritual basis of peace through application of the Golden Rule in international relations, and feels that without ethical and moral regeneration of man, mere organization of some kind of a League of Nations or World Police Force will not insure peace with Liberty and Justice.

* * *

The reviewer agrees with the authors that Soviet statesmen are using their best efforts to promote the welfare of the people through such internal policies as would raise the standard of living of the people—not merely material, but cultural as well. They are working for the peace and security of their people. They are trying to attain national security through peaceful means if possible, but will not hesitate to participate in a defensive or preventive war if need be. Political, economic and cultural collaboration between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. will be most beneficial to the peoples of these great nations as well as to the rest of the world and a supremely important factor in promotion of world peace.

TARAKNATH DAS

ONE WHIRL," by Sydney S. Baron, illustrated by George Grosz, Lowell Publishing Co., N. Y., \$1.00.

Hitler is dead and the peace talks have begun. But our dream of a better world of tomorrow becomes a nightmare in "One Whirl."

In his presentation of the post-war picture, Baron makes it a free-for-all. Representatives of the United Nations with Vichyites set up committees of long winded names and issue meaningless bulletins by the hundreds. The prosecution and punishment of war criminals boils down to very unfunny speeches made and supported by appeasers on Goebbel's and Hitler's new love for democracy, and a final plea for their lives.

While thus batting out their collective sins on making the so-called peace, back home, the Italian people overthrow their oppressors, De Gaulle takes over France, Japan surrenders to the United States and the Fascist leaders flee to Argentina.

The writer tries desperately to tickle the State Department to death by warning that the people will not accept an appeasing money peace. The people will hardly accept Baron's satiric burlesque treatment of such a life-death issue as the coming peace conference. There are some things about which we refuse to die laughing.

One of George Grosz's many illustrations shows a group of umbrellas, carrying portfolios complements the cynical note to the hilt.

NANCY FENTON

THE ALTAR AND THE WORLD, by Bernard L. Huddings Bell, Harper Bros., New York, pp. 148, \$1.25.

This book is a most excellent treatise on the sacrament of the "Lord's Supper" as it is commonly called in non-liturgical churches. The description and the interpretation of the Episcopal or Anglican form of the observance of this sacrament is illuminating and rewarding to everyone who seeks the step by step significance of this ancient rite for our modern world.

However, this reader confesses to a sense of disappointment as he laid down the book. It promised so much for the integration of worship, particularly corporate, formal, sacramental worship and social action and yet delivered so little! The best that can be said after reading Bell's book is that sacramentalism at its highest and best does not actually militate against social action. However to assume that the experience of the blessed communion with God and His Saints, i. e. our fellow-believers, in participation in the holy

mysteries of the Liturgy, is a prime motivation to a crusading spirit for a better world as we commonly interpret the concept of "social action," is nothing less than fantastic. The overwhelming passion for the coming of a better world and the willingness to labor, suffer and sacrifice for the realization of this goal apparently stems not from communion with the mysteries of the Lord's Supper but rather from the recoil of the human spirit against the age-old spectacle of "man's inhumanity to man," which, oddly enough, is shared by men and women of every faith or of no faith, in the usual meaning of the term.

"The Altar and the World" reveals, instead of the implications for social action which it deliberately sets forth as its purpose, something which unwittingly proves to be the counterpart of that thesis, namely that sacramental religion is the antithesis of prophetic religion, which is the true progenitor of the Protestant interpretation of the Christian gospel.

Although Isaiah had the vision of the Glory of God and the call to preach the word of the Lord in the temple, we cannot forget that the prophets of Israel were constantly in conflict with the priests who directed and controlled the temple worship. The most exalted messages of the prophets were not inspired by the sacramentalism of the temple sacrifice, but by direct communion of the prophetic spirit with the eternal in the stillness of the desert or in the tumult of the market place.

Our Protestant reformers gave to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper a less important role in religious experience, not because as the author assumes: "man went more than a little mad with the heady wine of a self assertive humanism" but indeed because the reformers recognized in the magical character of the celebration of the mass and the degradation of the mass by brazen exploitation of the credulity and superstition of the faithful the complete negation of the spiritual values of the communion which the Savior enjoined his followers to keep in remembrance of Him.

The Protestant church may well profit by a serious revaluation of the "Liturgy" as a genuine expression of the corporate worship of the mystical body of Christ but the Protestant Church must never depart from the spiritual concept of direct and immediate fellowship with God through Christ who said: "No man cometh to the Father but by me." This is not merely the essence of Protestantism, it is the abiding and imperishable content of the Christian religion.

PAUL M. SCHROEDER.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Enclosed find my check for \$10 as a contribution to the publication of THE PROTESTANT.

The prophetic voice of THE PROTESTANT has won my admiration and respect and, through the free copies that you have sent to this base, has caught the interest of Protestant chaplains here. Therefore, I am eager to help its increase in circulation.

James Luther Adams was my mentor in Meadville Theological Seminary, and it was through him that I first became interested in THE PROTESTANT.

JOHN RUSKIN CLARK,
Chaplain, USNR
Parris Island, S. C.

I am certain that many of the readers of THE PROTESTANT, who are impressed with the efforts it is making to stamp out anti-Semitism from the Christian community, will find your recent editorial on Bishop McIntyre's claim that anti-Semitism does not exist enlightening, especially in view of his hostile attitude to inter-faith cooperation. Let me bring to your attention the following excerpt from the Observation Post in *Metropolitan Church Life*, a weekly publication issued by the Greater New York Federation of Churches, vol. 17, no. 27, March 16, 1944. The writer says:

"Early in the summer I called upon Bishop McIntyre, I suggested to him that the interracial situation and the juvenile situation in New York were so serious as to challenge religious forces to take the initiative in bettering conditions. I asked him therefore, as Chancellor, if he would be willing to appoint three or four representatives to meet with three or four whom the Federation might appoint in order to explore the possibility of cooperative action.

"My suggestion was rather curtly rebuffed with the reply—'How can we cooperate with you? There is not a single Protestant minister in New York who believes that Christ is God!' To my question as to how many Protestant ministers he knew, he answered—'None.'"

One doubts that the attitude of Bishop McIntyre to the Protestant clergy in New York is that of the church which he represents.

WALTER S. BENTLEY
Staten Island, N. Y.

Katharine Salter's pertinent reply to the *Reader's Digest* article again* planned parenthood needs no further support.

Yet the following quote from the Pope's encyclical on marriage may be of some slight value:

"Holy Church knows well that not infrequently one of the parties is sinned against rather than sinning when for a grave cause he or she reluctantly allows perversion of the right order.* In such a case there is no sin, provided that, mindful of the law of charity, he or she does not neglect to seek to dissuade and to deter the partner from sin. Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the married state use their right in the proper manner although on account of natural reasons, either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth."***

Current History, Vol. 33, 797ff.
Feb., 1931, P. XVII.

* Ordinary Birth Control.

** Rhythm.

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN
Rochester, N. Y.